# A REPLY TO SOTCLIFFES ANSVVER TO the Surney of the nevv Religion, in which his insufficient ansvvers, and manifold follies are discouered, vvhervvith the Aduersarie vvas charged: most partes of the Catholike Doctrine explicated, and al is auerred, and confirmed: and almost al pointes of the nevv faith of Ingland disproued.

*Set forth by* MATTHEW KELLISON *Doctor of Diuinitie, and Professor of the same in the Vniuersitie of Rhemes.*

Si contuderis stultum in ptisana non auferetur ab eo stultitia eius. *Prouerb.* 27.
*If thou punne a foole in a morter thou shalt not take from him his foolishenes.*

Reuelabitur ignominia tua, & videbo opprobrium tuũ. *Esa.*47.
*Thy ignominie shalbe reuealed, and I vvill see thy shame.*

Imprinted at Rhemes by Simon Foigny Printer to the most Honorable & Gracious Levvis of Lorraine Arch-bishop & Duke of Rhemes.

*Vvith Permission.* 1608.



# THE EPISTLE DEDICATORIE TO THE vvorthy and conſtant Catholikes of Ingland.

SOME yeares paſt (Honorable and beloued Catholikes) I preſumed to preſent his Maieſtie our Noble Soueraigne vvith a Booke intituled, *The Suruey of the nevv Religion*, moued ſo to doe, for tvvoe ſo vrgent cauſes, as th'one had been ſufficient. The firſt vvas a due reſpect to my Prince, to vvhom I ought that office: the other vvas, a deepe conceyued greefe and regret of your ſo long perſequution, in vvhich by compaſſion, I could not but ſuffer vvith you. To ſatisfie the firſt dutie, vvhileſt others vvere buſied in receiuing the King into his Realm of Ingland, I and others made preparation for his reception into the Kingdom of Chriſtes Catholike Church. in vvhich al his predeceſſours had receiued their Sacring, Crovvns, and Scepters: a Pallace more Royal, and Maieſtical, then any *Nonſuch, Louure*, or *Eſcuriа*, yea then a *Salomons Temple (becauſe the glorie of the laſt hovvſe is greater then* Aggei. 2.

*that of the first*) where for his Maiestie to haue been a subiect had been greater honour, then in Inglād to bee a Soueraign: this Subiectiō giuing a Title to a greater Kingdom, thē that Soueraigntie: yea, where to haue obeyed humbly, had been to haue raigned there more securelie. And vvhilest others to shevv their loyal affections offered him the richest guiftes, vvhich the vvorld could afford: I presented him vvith a guift, the greatest that heauen bestovveth on mortal men: vvhich vvas the Catholike and only true Christian Religion: the guift of God, the Treasure of the Church, the Legacie of al the ancient Kinges of England, vvhich vvith their Kingdomes they bequeathed to their Successors, the richest pearle of their crovvn, the greatest honour of their Roialtie, the safetie and securitie of their state, the vveale of their Kingdom, and the Saluation (vnles al Christian Kinges vvere damned) of themselues and their Subiectes. To satisfie my compassionate affection tovvardes you (my beloued brethren) I pleaded for a libertie and freedom from persequution, the ease of your afflicted myndes, the due of your consciences, and the right of your Religion. Vvhich the Prince ovveth to you no lesse, yea more, then the cōseruation of the temporal state, liues, liuinges, and liberties of his Subiectes.

But because, ether I knevv not vvhat I asked, (persequution being our surest and most compēdious vvay to heauen) libertie of conscience our aduersaries vveale and benefit, or else, for our sinnes, or Gods secret Iudgementes, it hath not pleased the *diuine Goodnes*, so to inspire our Prince, as

to accept, him ſelfe, of ſo great a good, as is the Catholique Religion, or to permit it to others: but rather both he and others that gouerne the preſent ſtate vnder him, haue thought it beſt, to make vvarre againſt that Religion, which al their noble Predeceſſours haue defended by ſvvordes & Scepters: I haue thought good (moſt conſtant Catholiques) to dedicate this booke vnto your diſtreſſed perſons, hoping to comfort you in perſequution by this, vvho could not free you from it by that: you eſpeciallie hauing as much claime to the book, as intereſt in the Subiect. For in this booke you ſhal find the nevv Church and her preachers proued baſtard and vnlavvful, the nevv doctrin point by point refuted: and you ſhal ſee the Catholike Romain Church and her Paſtours defended, the Catholique doctrin almoſt in al pointes cleared and confirmed, the Prieſts and Religious for vvhoſe entertainment you ſuffer, authorized and eſtabliſhed: & ſo reading in this book vvho they are that perſequute you, and for vvhat Church and Religion they perſequute you: you may to your comfort acknovvledg in your Aduerſaries, the ancient perſequutors of the primatiue Church, in your ſelues the true progenie of th' old Martyrs, and Confeſſors.

2. Othervviſe, as to perſequute ſo to be perſequuted, is common to the good and bad, but it is the good cauſe only that iuſtifieth the perſequuted, and accuſeth the Perſequutors. For as S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *Occiderunt impij Prophetas, occiderunt impios & Prophetæ: the vvicked killed the Prophetes, and the Prophets killed the vvicked*: but the cauſe being Aug epi. 50.

different, the death of them vvas Martyrdom, of these a iust punishment And therfore Christe saith not, *happie are they vvho suffer persequution,* Matth 5. but *vvho suffer persequution for iustice sake.* And his Apostle *Samct Peter*, keeping vvel in mynd, this his Maisters lesson, saith: *if you suffer any thing* 1.Pet.3. *for iustice, blessed are you.* This doctrine seemeth to the Gentils follie, to the levves scandal, to the vvorld à Paradox: and the truth therof, neither *Epicure*, vvhoe placed fœlicitie in pleasar, nor *Aristotle*, vvho parchead vp an happines of the goods of the mynd, fortune, and the body, could euer discouer: only Christians haue learned this Philosophie. They are taught not to settle their affections on riches, vvhich are gotten vvith labour, kept vvith feare, and lost with sorovv: nor to put any happines in honor or fame, which depend on mens opinions, yea breathes and blastes of their mouthes: nor yet in authoritie, vvhich settes vs on high to giue vs the greater fall, or to expose vs the more openly to the dartes of fortune, vvhich layeth vs in beddes of doune, but fraught vvith broken sleepes, adornes our heades vvith crovvnes but vvhich are fuller of cares then pretious stones, setteth daintie dishes before vs, but in vvhich is feare of poison. They haue learned that no fœlicitie is to bee found in any of the goods of the bodie, whose beautie is parched vvith the Sunne, vvhose strength an ague quelleth, vvhose pleasures are but deceiuing baytes, thorny roses, svveet poisons, & so are pleasures of th: body, that they are the greatest displeasures of t.e sovvle, endarkening her vnderstanding, per-

uerting her vvil, vveakening her irascible, effeminating her cõcupiscible part and facultie. This doctrine you also (my beloued brethren) haue learned in the schoole of Christ, and by the light of faith, haue discouered that, vvhich al the Philosophers could not by light of reason: to vvit, riches in pouertie, gain in losse, clothing in nakednes, strength in infirmitie, honor in disgrace, pleasur in paynes, ease in labour, Satietie in honger, consolation in sorovv, life in death, fœlicite in persequution and miserie.

3. Certes (my dearest brethren) vvhen I behold your estate, vvith an eye enlightned by faith, I count you & our countrie for you, the most happie on earth, though to a vvordly eye you may seem to bee a *peripsema* of the people, the out cast of your nation, and an *anathema* from Christe, mispriſed of the vvorld, forsaken of God. In so much that I esteem not the heauens to shine so gloriously vvhen they are beset with starres in a frostie night, as doth the Horizont of Inglãd beset vvith as many Sunnes, as Martyrs, Virgins, and Confessors, in this so long a night of persequution. For as the night begetteth not the starres, but yet maketh them to appeare vvhich the day light had hidden: so persequution though it haue not caused, yet it hath occasioned many a glorious Martyr and Confessor, and hath made ther glittering vertues to appeare in this night, vvhich in the day of prosperitie were couered from our sightes: not that persequution, is of it selfe so glorious (because heretikes and false Prophets, yea theeues and murderers are persequute:) but bicause the iustice Rom. 9.

ce of your cauſe, vvhich is Chriſtes faith, graceth your perſequution, and your perſequution thus graced, innobleth your ſelues, & as it were inameleth your ſowles and makes them to glitter in the Firmamēt of our Engliſh Church, more glorioufly, then if it vvere beſet vvith as many Sunnes by day as it is with ſtarres by night. But becauſe it ſeemeth as repugnāt to a vvordlinges eye, that fœlicitie ſhould ly hiddē in perſequutiō, as that miſerie ſhould be fœlicitie, vvee muſt a litle vnfold perſequutiō, & lay opē to the vevv her ſecret perfectiōs.

4. Firſt then perſequution is the ſoueraign Phyſick of the ſovvle, vvhich recureth al her diſeaſes. And therfore as the Sickmannes true fœlicitie cōſiſteth in healthfull potions and medicins bee they neuer ſo bitter and vnpleaſant: ſo perſequution though neuer ſo diſtaſtfull to ſenſualitie fleſh and bloud, is the true fœlicitie of our diſeaſed ſoule, vvhileſt ſhee keepeth the bed of this mortal body, ſicke of as many diſeaſes as ſinnes, paſſions, and perturbations, bicauſe it is a ſoue-
D. Th. 1.2 q. 85. a. 3. rain remedie againſt all her maladies. The ſovvle by ſinne hath receiued fovvre cruel vvoundes in fovvre partes and povvers. The vnderſtanding, vvhoſe perfection is knovvledge, and vvhoſe obiect is truth, is of it ſelfe, endarkened vvith ignoraunce: The vvil vvhoſe proper operation is loue, and vvhoſe end and butte is good, is peruerted with mallice, which cauſeth in it a prones to euil: The iraſcible part vvhoſe gole is difficultie, and vvhoſe glorie is victorie, is vveakened vvith infirmitie, vvhich makes the ſoule yeeld to al difficulties: The concupiſcible part,

Whoſe propertie is to deſire thinges conuenient, and vvhoſe fœlicitie is contentment, is gauled vvith itching concupiſcence, vvhich makes the ſoule inordinately to deſire vnlavvful delightes and pleaſures. Perſequution is a Soueraign Medicin againſt them al. And firſt it enlightneth th' vnderſtanding, according to that, *affliction dat intellectum, affliction giueth vnderſtanding*: and giuing vnderſtanding, diſpelleth ignorance. *Nabuchodonoſor*, *Manaſſes*, and *Antiochus* by affliction learned to knovv God, and to ſee their enormous ſinnes, vvho in proſperitie knevv not them ſelues. *Ioſephes* brethren vvho blinded With enuie, ſold their ovvn brother, as oft as aduerſitie croſſed them, made that goodly confeſſion: *meritò hæc patimur, quia peccauimus in fratrem noſtrum, vvorthilie do vvee ſuffer theſe croſſes, becauſe vvee haue offended againſt our brother*: and till miſerie had taught the prodigal Sonne vvit, he neuer knevv vvhat it Was to liue at home in his Fathers hovvſe. So that perſequution is a ſharpe vvater, but vvhich cleareth the eyes: a fire but Which illuminateth: a thunder but vvhich lightneth: a night, but in vvhich the ſtarres of Gods illuſtrations do moſt appeare: a Water, but in vvhich as in a glaſſe, vvee ſee our ſelues, our ſinnes, Heauen, and God: a rodd, but vvhich directeth, ruleth, and inſtructeth. Perſequutiõ alſo cureth the mallady of mallice, by vvhich the vvil is vvaxen to prone to euil: becauſe, like a rodd it keepes the vvill in avv of reaſon: like a bridle it reſtraines her from ranging beyond the boundes Which reaſon and Gods lavv haue preſcribed: like a file, it ſcoureth her from the ruſt of ſinne:

like a lancing knife by cutting it cureth her: *Malum malo pellit*, by euil which it inflicteth on the body, it expelleth the mallice of the ſoule. As vvhen the Schoole-maiſter entreth vvith his rodd, the Schollers leaue there playing, and vnhappines, and euery one repayres to his place and ranke: ſo When the rodd of perſequution, appeareth in the Schoole of Chriſte, euerie one reformeth one, and ſo looketh to his life and actions as no wantõnes or malicious vnhappines bee found in thẽ. Perſequution cureth th' infirmitie of the iraſcible parte in this manner. This parte of the ſoule, by to much yelding becommeth impotent in reſiſting, for vvant of vſe is vnvveldie, and by to much eaſe vnable: perſequutiõ, by heaping aduerſities on the ſoule, makes her ſtrõg in bearing, by oppoſing difficulties, enureth her tõ vvreſtle and ſtruggle vvith them. For as the face better indureth the cold vvindes then the necke bicauſe it is more often expoſed to them, as the tree is moſt ſtrong in body, moſt firm at the roote, vvhich hath been moſt ſhaken vvith vvindes, moſte beaten vvith tempeſtes: ſo they vvho are accuſtomed to aduerſities, are moſt ſtrong in bearing them. Nothing conſiſteth leſſe then vvater, yet the froſt ſo hardeneth it, that it becõmeth a Chriſtal floore and pauement: nothing more ſoft then clay, yet by fire, it is made as hard as a ſtone: and although nothing as *S. Baſil* ſaith bee more vvateriſh, vveakiſh, and effeminate, then a ſoule vſed to pleaſures, delicaties & delightes, yet by the fire of perſequution *Iobs* ſoule vvas as hard *as a pitcher*, and *Dauid* ſo diſſolued vvith laſciui-

Iob.

ouſnes vvhen he liued in proſperitie, in the froſt of *Saules* perſequution, became as hard and firm *as a bottel in the froſt*. Laſtlie perſecution cureth the diſeaſe of concupiſcence vvhich is an hoate burning feuer, a thirſtie hydropſie, thirſting after delightes and al that is pleaſing to ſenſualitie. For as the young colte, by to much eaſe and prouendor, waxeth vvanton and full of vnhappie trickes, but by the bridle, ſpurr, and diminution of his oates is made more tame and tractable: ſo by ſofte and vvarme cloathes, delicate fare, hoate and pleſaunt vvines, eaſe and freenes from cares, ſenſualitie becommeth coltiſh and vnrulie: but by perſequution vvhich ſizeth her prouendor, deſpoileth her of pleaſing commodities, and loadeth her vvith encombrances, ſhee puttes of al vnhappines, and playeth the vvanton no more. This *S. Hieron* confirmeth by the example of a young man, vvho being much importuned by the tentations of the fleſh, complained therof to his Superiour: hee being an expert Phiſitian, preſcribed him a receit of perſequution, ſecretlie cauſing another to accuſe, vexe, and perſecute him. Vvhich being done he demaunded of his patient vvhether ſtill he vvas moleſted vvith thoſe tentations? *Pape* (ſaid the young man) *viuere mihi non licet, & fornicari libeat. Vvhat aſke you me that queſtion? I can not liue quietlie and can I haue any luſt to fornication?* The ſame Doctor (vvho him ſelfe knocked his breſt with a ſtone, lay on the bare ground, faſted, vvhipped him ſelfe ſeuerlie, ſo to tame his fleſh and concupiſcence) telleth hovv *S. Hilarion* feeling rebellion in his fleſh, called his body his Aſſe and ſpake to

Pſal. 108. Baſil. ibid.

Hiero. ad Ruſt. Monach.

Hieron. in vita Hilarion.

it in this māner: *Ego Aſelle faciam vt non calcitres &c. I, Thou Aſſe, vvill make thee leaue thy kicking, for I vvill not feed thee vvith barly but vvith chaffe, I vvill pine thee vvith hunger and thirſt, I Will lay loades vpon thee, I vvill lead thee thorough heate and cold, to make thee thinke of hunger, rather then laſciuiouſnes.* So *S. Paule* did chaſtice his body till it vvas blacke and blevv as the Greeke vvord ὑπωπιάζω ſignifieth, ſo al the Saintes of God by faſting, heerclothes, diſciplines, and ſuch like taming exerciſes, haue ſubiugated the *lavv of the members* to the *lavv of the minde*, the body to the ſoule, the fleſh to the Spirit, and ſenſualitie to reaſon. And if vvee do not this of our ſelues, God him ſelfe takes the rodd of perſequution in his hand, and doth it for vs, and better then vvee can doe. For as *S. Auſtin*, and *S. Gregorie Nazianzen* haue obſerued, it is no eaſie thing to rule our own fleſh and ſenſualitie, and though in general vvee eaſilie knovv that vvee muſt vſe meates as Medicins, and rule our bodies as vvee do our horſes, that is ſo as they may ſerue the ſoule and not caſt her: yet vvhen vvee come to particulers, vvee finde ſuch difficulties, that not one amongeſt an hundred, can tel hovv to rule this beaſt. For vvhileſt vvee vvould chaſtice our bodie that it may be buxom to the ſpirit, vvee kill it, and make it vnable to ſerue the ſoule in her functions; and vvhileſt vvee nouriſh it that it may be able, vvee pamper concupiſcence, vvhich makes it headſtrong and vnruly: and therfore better it is that God ſhould apply this remedie by perſequution, vvho knovves beſt hovv and vvhen to vſe the rodde, in vvhat meaſure the body is to

Aug. l. 10. confeſſ. c. 31. Nazian. orat. de amand. pauper.

be nouriſhed, how our afflictions are to bee tempered, and vvhat vvaightes of aduerſities vvee are able to beare, bicauſe hee giuing grace to beare them, doth beſt knovv our ſtrengthes and forces.

5. Receue then (my deareſt brethren) this ſcourging rodd of perſequution, at your almightie Fathers hand: and remẽbring that it is reached you by a Fathers hand, kiſſe it and imbrace it. Receue not only patiently but alſo ioyfully this challice of affliction at his handes, it is the Soueraign potion, vvhich your louing and expert Phiſitian hath preſcribed. pledge him, hee hath begun vnto you, and beginning hath taken avvay the bitternes. He, vvhether he cheriſh you by fomentations, annointments, and reſtauritie of proſperitie, or chaſtiſeth you by the bitter potions, purgations, and lancinges of aduerſities, is ſtill a louing Phiſitian, and doth both of the ſame affectiõ; and euen then vvhen he vexeth you, hee isnot angrie vvith you, but vvith your diſeaſe, and ſtill loueth you. Thinke not then, that this long perſequutiõ is a ſign of Gods wrath & indignatiõ againſt you, thinke not that he hath forſaken you, or neglecteth your caſe and cauſe: thus hee hath vſed al his greateſt fauorites, euen his diſciples, euen his mother, euen his louing & beloued Sonne. The heade hath been crovvned vvith thornes, the mẽbers muſt feele the prickinges. The natural body of Chriſte hath been torne vvith vvhippes and ſcourges, ſo muſt the Church his myſtical body, and conſequently vvee the members: and if vvee vvil be beloued, vvee muſt be ſcourged, bicauſe

Hiero. ep. ad Eusto. quę est speculum Virg.

hee chastiseth vvhen he loueth. *Quis Sanctorum* (saith S. Hierom) *sine certamine coronatus est? quære & inuenies, singulos aduersa perpessos: solus Salomon in delitiis fuit, & forsitan ideo corruit: Vvho of all the Saintes vvas euer crovvned vvithout fighting a combat? seeke and thou shalt finde, that euery one of them suffred aduersities: only Salomon vvas lulled in delightes, and therfore perchaunce he perished.* If vvee will purchase heauen, wee must assault it by force, if vvee vvill followve Christe, wee must beare part of his crosse, if vvee vvill liue godly wee must suffer persequutiō, & if we will bee entertained in Gods seruice vvee must prepare our soules to Tentation, the vvorld shall reioice, wee must vweepe and lamēt, that vvee may reioice vvhen the vvorld shal vweepe. *Vicibus disposita res est* (saith Tertullian) *nunc illis lætantur nos cōsiliamur, lugeamus ergo dum Ethnici gaudēt, vt cum lugere cœperint gaudeamus, ne pariter nūc gaudēte, tunc quoque pariter lugeamus: the thing is disposed by turnes, novv they reioice, vvee are afflicted, let vs mourn then vvhilest th' Ethnikes are merrie that vvhen they begin to mourn vvee may bee merrie, least novv reioising vvith them, vvee also then lament vvith them.* Seing God than hath so disposed that here vvee should bee persequuted, and vvee also aboue al other nations, let vs not seeke to alter his desygnmentes, persequution being our soueraign Phisike, a sign of Gods loue tovvardes vs, yea (vvhich I shal novv shevv) our perfection here, and glorie herafter.

Terrul li. de Spectaculis.

6. Nothing is brought to perfection almost, but by a kind of persequution. The stone can not proue a *statua*, nor haue any honorable place in the building, vvithout much hammering, nether

muſt vvee the liuelie ſtones of Chriſtes Church of vvhich he is the corner ſtone, yea foundation; haue any place of credit in this building, vnleſſe vvee indure as the corner ſtone Chriſt hath done, many knockes and hammeringes of aduerſities.

*Tunſionibus, preſſuris,*
*Expoliti lapides,*
*Suis coaptantur locis,*
*Per manus artificis,*
*Diſponuntur, permanſuri*
*Sacris ædificiis.*

And therfore Martyrs, vvho dying, haue the higheſt roome in the building of the Churche militant, and after death haue the moſt honorable place in the Church triumphant, are moſt of al hãmered, by perſequution. To vvhich *Tertullian*, alluding, and mocking alſo at the ſtony Godds of the Gentils, ſayth that before they could be ſtatuaes and adored for goddes they ſuffered as much as our Martyrs did. The grapes before they bee made vvine muſt be trodden and preſſed, and vvee (ſayth *S. Auſtin*) if euer vvee bee layed vp for good vvine in Gods Cellar, muſt be trodden, preſſed, and cruſhed vvith perſequution or afflictions. The gold before it can bee pure, muſt be refined in the fier, & before it come to bee ſome honorable peece of plate for a Princes Cubbard, it muſt bee vvel beaten vvith the Goldſmithes hammer: and thinke vvee to bee tryed and refined gold, or euer to ſtand on Chriſtes cubbard, as veſſelles to carye Chriſtes name (as S. Paule vvas) vnleſſe vvee paſſe the fier

August. in Pſal. 83.

and indure the hammer of perſequution? The Trompets vvhich in the old lavv ſounded before the Arke & afterwardes in the temple, which
Pſal. 97. Dauid calleth *tubas ductiles*, paſſed thorough the fier and vnder the hammer, before they came to
Aug. ibid. ſuch perfection as to ſound melodiouſly. *Quid ſibi volunt* (ſayth, S. Auſtin) *tubæ iſtæ ductiles? ductiles tubæ aneæ ſunt, tundendo producuntur, ſi tundendo, ergo vapulando, eritis tubæ ductiles, ad laudem Dei productæ. ſi cum tribulamini proficiatis tribulatio, tunſio, profectus productio eſt: VVhat is meant by theſe long trompets? long trompets are brazen, and are lengthened by beating and hammering. If by hammering, then by beating you ſhal be long trompets, lengthned to prayſe God. If vvhen you bee afflicted, you profit, your tribulation is your hammering, your profit made thereby, is your lengthning.* Such a trompet vvas Iob vvho after much hammering ſounded out that harmonical voice, *If vvee haue receaued good at Gods handes, vvhy ſhould vvee not receaue euil?* Such trompets vvere the Apoſtles, vvhich promulgared the nevv lavv, ſounded out the prayſe of Chriſtes name in al partes of the World, and by their blaſtes caſt dovvn the vvalles of *Hiericho*, and the fortreſſes of ſinne and Idolatrie. Before the tree beare fruite, it is, firſt a litle ſeed mortified in the earth, then a tender ſprigge vvhich indureth cold and ſharp blaſtes, then a tree vvhich is lopped and pruned and ſo cometh to the perfection of bearing fruite: ſo the iuſt mā,
Pſal. 1. *vvho is a tree planted by the vvaters of* Gods graces, is firſt mortified like a ſeed in humilitie, then hardened vvith the blaſtes of aduerſities, then lopped and pruned from al ſuperfluities of vvordly

commo

commodities, before he bud forth good desires, and bring forth the merites and fruites of good vvorkes. The harper sayth *S. Chrysostom, non prius desinit nervum intendere donec perfectum edat sonũ*, doth not leaue of stretching and extending the cordes of his instrument, till it yeeld a gratefull and agreeing sound: and God stretcheth the povvers of our soule by tribulation, to make them sound melodiously. O vvhat musick made that harpe Christe Iesus stretched on the crosse, vvhich, like *Dauids* harpe terrified the deuil, pleased and appeased God, conforted sinners, recreated the iust, and delighted the Angels in heauen? Vvhat melodie made the martyrs euen of our tyme and countrie, streched on the rackes, dravvne on the hirdles, hanged on the gibbettes? hovv melodious vvere their confessions? hovv shrillie and yet hovv svveetly did their passiõs sound, which allured so many to imbrace that religion for vvhich they suffred? To be breife, if it vvere possible in this matter, the corn by threshing is purified from the chaffe, the camomile by treading grovveth thicker, the palme tree by bearing is dilated, spices punned in the mortar, sauour svveetest, iron by filing becometh smother, and nothing almost cometh to perfectiõ, but by suffring and induring. The prize or gole is not gotten but by vvrestling or running, the victorie is not atchieued but by fighting, vvages are not gained but by vvorking, no trade or arte is learned but by exercising: and thinke vvee to come to perfection in the trade of a Christian life, vnlesse vvee be excercised by aduersitie? think

Wee to gain the gole and prize of heauen by ſuffring nothing, to vvhich al the martyrdomes in the vvorld are of them ſelues nothing? It is certain then, that noe Sainte euer came to perfectiō but by aduerſitie either layed on him by others, or taken of him ſelfe voluntarilie: and the greateſt Saintes, euen to the *Saincte of Saincties*, the more perfect the vvere, the deeper plunged in afflictiōs. For as litle fiſhes, ſayth a Father, are found in euerie ſhallovv foord or ditch, but the greater fiſhes in riuers, and vvhales only in the Sea: ſo Chriſtians of ordinarie perfection may liue in lovv vvaters of litle aduerſities, but Saintes and the greateſt Chriſtians in deepe riuers only, or ſeas of afflictions. For as in that vvee are Chriſtians, like fiſhes vvee haue our ſource and origin from the vvater of *Baptiſm*: ſo if vvee vvil be perfect Chriſtians vvee muſt be baptiſed again in the vvaters of aduerſities; euen as the great fiſh Chriſte, vvhom the *Sybill* called ἰχθυν, of vvhom vvee are the litle Spawnes, was plunged ſo depelly, in theſe vvaters, *that they entred euen into his ſoule*. So that to bee perſequuted is no ſigne of Gods ill vvill, but rather of loue and fauour, far greater to the perſecuted thē to the perſequutor. For vvhich loueth the maſon better, the hāmer or the ſtone he knocketh? Vvhich loueth the Huſband man more dearly, the tree or the lopping hatchet or pruning kinfe? the flaile or the corn he treſheth? what is more deare to the Gold ſmith, the Gold or the fire? Vvhat liketh the ſmith better, the file, or better the iron he fileth. The Apothecarie vvhether eſtimeth he more his Spices, or his peſtill that

Tertul. li. de Bapt.

punneth thē? Vvhich loueth the father better, the childe or the rodde wherwith he ſcourgeth him? Certes, as the correctiō being done, the rodde is caſt into the fier, the child is cheriſhed, ſo vvhen god by his roddes & ſcourges, our perſequutors, hath done the due correctiō, they vnleſſe they repent before, ſhal bee caſt into Hel fier, wee if wee take the correction patiently, ſhalbe cheriſhed in heauen perpetuallie. Nether is it any hurt to be perſequuted, nether do vvee receue any more harme of the perſequutor, thē the ſtone receueth by caruing, the grapes by preſſing, the gold by the forge, the golden plate by the hammer, the tree by lopping, the harpe by ſtretching, the corne by threſhing, the camomile by treading, the ſpices by punning, the iron by filing, and the childe by whipping. Not al the Premunires, priſons, rackes, tormentes, deathes can hurt vs, vnles vvee vvill, yea al ſhal turn to our good if vvee vvill. No man ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom* is hurt by any but by him ſelfe. *The ruſt* (ſaith he) *hurteth iron, the moate the vvolle, the vvolfe the flocke of ſheep, the vineger the vvine, the cockle and darnel the corn, the haile the vniard: but nether ſickne, nor baniſhment, nor death nor iniurie, nor contumelie, nor vveapon, hurteth a man, but only cupiditie, impatience, and malice of mynd.* Vvee may therfore ſay to our perſequutor as *Anaxarchus* ſayed to the Tirant that punned him, *Tunde Anaxarchi vaſculum non ipſum Anaxarchum*, thou tormenteſt our bodies vvhich are but the veſſels and caſes of the ſoule, but vs thou hurteſt not, bicauſe thou hurteſt not our ſoule which is the cheefeſt part of vs. thou breakeſt dovvn the walle of the hovvſe,

Homil. quod nemo lædi-tur niſi à ſeipſo.

but thou toucheſt not the good mā of the howſe: thou armeſt thy furie againſt the cheſt or coffer, but canſt not finger the treaſur: becauſe of our faith thou canſt not deſpoile vs, of our conſtancie thou canſt not bereue vs, our vvilles thou canſt not compel, our conſciences thou canſt not enforce. Our bodies only are at thy pleaſur, vvhich only thou canſt hurt, but the ſoule by patience like the Philoſophers ſtone turneth al this harme to our good, and that vvith the iuſt cauſe for vvhich vvee ſuffer, conuertes this droſſe into gold, theſe afflictions into merites, yea crovvnes and diademes of glorie.

7. Happie then are you (for vvith you I vvil begin) vvho by præmunires, confiſcations, Maſſe-mulctes, and ſuch like meanes haue loſt your landes, liuinges, goods and offices; this loſſe is noe loſſe but gain. If it be true, vvhich *S. Chryſoſtome* ſaith, that *eleemoſyna eſt ars omnium quæſtuoſiſſima*, *giuing of almes to the poore, is the moſt gainfull arte of al artes* and *trades:* hovv much more gainfull is it to giue al at once, for Chriſte and his Churches cauſe? Aſſure yout ſelues, you haue done but as merchauntes or vſuters doe, vvho lay out al to receue al again vvith a Surplus. you haue done but as huſbādmen doe, who caſt their ſeed, on lādes, not to caſt it aWay, but to receue in haruеſt for euery ſeed an hūdred. your for going of theſe goods is but merchaūtes laying out, your loſſe of thē is not caſting avvay but ſowing. And as merchauntes vvhē they haue layed out al their mony, & huſbandmen vvhen they haue emptied their barnes for ſowing, are the the richeſt beau-

ſe they expect encreaſe: ſo you that in this cauſe haue loſt al, are richer then before, becauſe in heauen you ſhal receue merchãdiſe for your mony layed out, and an harueſt for your goods ſowed, vvhich ſhal farre ſurmount your loſſes. For temporal traſh of the earth, vvhich theeues ſteale, moates eate, ruſte conſumes, death at laſt taketh from you, you ſhal receue incorruptible treaſures layed vp in ſtore for you, God ſhal bee your riches, heauen your Kingdom. you haue ſowed cornes in ſorrovv, you ſhal receue handfulles in ioy, you haue ſowed vvith teares, but vvhich are rayn to make your ſeedes ſprout forth: In heauen you ſhall receue plentifulle harueſt, & for euerie ſeed an harueſt.

8. Happie you alſo vvho lye in bondes and chaynes for Chriſte, and as much more happie then they, as your libertie vvhich you forgoe, is greater then the riches vvhich they haue loſt. no priſon is to you a priſon, to vvhom al the vvorld is a priſon, no ill ayre there, vvhere you your ſelues are *bonus odor*, that perfumeth the place, no darkenes there, vvhere your vertues ſhine and glitter. your legges are tyed, but the faculties of yᵉ mynde are free, your bodie goeth not abroad, your ſoule vvalketh in heauen by contemplatiõ and heauenly conuerſation: your perſequutors haue reſtrained your libertie of bodie, but you are more free in ſpirit then they: thoſe your fetters are more pretious to you then chaynes of gold and linkes of pretious ſtones, they are *Hieroglyffes* of the linke of frendſhip, vvhich linketh you to Chriſte ſo faſte, that al the deuilles in hell Ro. 8.

can not breake it, vnleſſe you your ſelues vvill. O priſons not priſons, but princely pallaces. O priſonners, not priſonners, but honorable freemen. S *Paule* gloried more in the Title of *priſoner of Ieſus Chriſte*, then in the dignitie of an Apoſtle. S. *Chryſoſtome*, ſo extolleth this Title, that he ſayth, to be fettered for Chriſte is more glorious, "then to vveare a crown of Gold beſet vvith pearles, and that the priſon is ſo honoured by the "priſonner, that it ſurpaſſeth al Princes pallaces, "yea heauen it ſelfe. And therfore, ſayth he, if it "vvere put to my choiſe vvhether I vvould ſit at "the right hand in heauen, or lye chained in priſon, vvhether I would dvvel with th' Angelles in "heauen or vvith Paule in priſon, I vvould make "election of the priſon. If it vvere demaunded of "mee, vvhether I vvould bee the Angels that looſed Peters chaines or Peter hampered in them, "I vvould chooſe to bee Peter. I honor Paule "(ſayth he) not ſo much for that he vvas an Apoſtle and Doctor of the Gentills, not ſo much for "that he vvas aſſumpted and taken vp to the third "heauen, as for that he vvas bound in priſon for "Chriſte. And I reuerence Paules handes, not ſo "much for that they vvrought miracles, or could "not be ſtinged by the vipers, as for that they were manicled for Chriſte. And although this may ſeem a paradox to a vvordling, yet (ſayth he) *Si quis ergò Dominum inſanit, vt ita dicam, ſi quis ardet, is nouit quæ ſit vinculorum virtus, & quanta dignitas:* *If any (to ſay ſo) dote of Chriſte, if any burn vvith loue towardes him, he knovveth vvhat is the vertue of chaines, and hovv great is their dignitie.* To vſe S. *Ciprians* wor-

Ephes. 3. & 4. & ad Philem.

des, and to borow eloquence of that Christian

*Cicero these chaines are ornamentes not bonder, Which com-* Cipr. li. 3.
*ple not Christians feet to ignominie, but do grace them to* epi. 25. ad
*glorie. O feet happilie tyed, vvhich are loosed not by the* Martyr.
*Smith but by Christe. O feet happilie tyed, to be directed*
*the right vvay to paradise. O feet tyed in this vvorld for*
*the praesent, to be set at libertie vvith Christe for euer.*

Honourable prisoners, I should enuy certes this your honor and felicitie, if I could ether thinke my selfe vvorthy of such a dignitie, or æsteeme this your glorie a hindraunce to myne. your bondage is true libertie, noe such Princes Pallaces, no *Non-such*, like your prisons, no chaynes of Gold, like your fetters, no bracelettes like your manicles.

9. And you likewise who liue in banishment, confort your selues, and let mee comfort my selfe vvith you. you, in that you haue more libertie seem inferiour to those that are chained for Christe, but yet in that your banishment is a ciuil death, and so æsteemed by the ciuil law, you seem to take the precedēce of them, and to marche in the next rāke to martyrs: for you are deid to your natiue soile, countrie, freindes, and cōmodities; and although by flying persequution you seem to auoyd the feeld, yet in deed your flying is a confession of your faith, and this reatr is a kind of cōbate. for vvhen you fly, men knovv for vvhat you fly, and so your faith is made knovven, and in leauing your countrie, you ouercome al natural affection to parentes, kinsfolkes, natiue soile, and so do enter a certain cōbat against your selues in defence of faith and

l. 64. §. Sacetas. l. 66 §. Publicatio ff. pro Socio. & l. Gallus. §. & quid si. ff. de lib. Posth.

Religion. It is hard I graunt to ouercome this affectiõ, the natiue ſoile being ſo deare to euery one. But ſeing that vvee chaunge the countrie of our body for the Catholike Church in vvhich our ſoule hath receiued her ſpiritual natiuitie and being, & by dying to our countrie and freinds, doe liue to Chriſte and his Church, better it is to liue abrod, then to dy at home. Vvherfore as *Ariſtides* being demaunded, vvhat thing moſt greeued him in baniſhment anſvvered, *the diſgrace of my countrie vvhich it ſuffreth by baniſhing mee:* ſo let vs lament moſt the diſhonor of our countrie before God and men, for being ſo cruel againſt her ovvn children, and for that Religion alſo, vvhich ſhe hath deliuered to them by a lõg tradition euen from her firſt conuerſion: othervviſe for vs to be remoued out of our countrie for ſo good a cauſe, it is no more hurte then for trees to bee tranſplanted into a better ſoile and ayre. As *Socrates* being aſked vvhat Countriman he vvas, anſvvered he vvas *mundanus*, of the countrie of the World: and *Hercules* being demaunded the ſame queſtion, ſayd al Greece vvas his countrie: So let vs count al nations our countrie, vvhere the Catholique Church is. For vvhat, I pray you do vvee count our countrie? the Chamber or Hovvſe vvhere vvee vvere born? ô litle countrie, or rather conyhole. The Shire or Prouince? then many of thẽ that liue in England, are alſo baniſhed men? England? And vvhy ſo? ſeing that other countries border ſo neare vpon it and many countries many times are gouerned by the ſame Prince & Potẽtate. Yea ſeing that the ſame

heauēs do cōpaſſe vs, the ſame globe of the earth ſuſteineth vs, the ſame ſunne & mone ſhine vpon vs, the ſame ayre is matter of breathing to vs, let vs ſay with *Euripedes* that *euery ſoyle to a mā of courage is his cōtrie*. But bee it that ſome particular place is the only countrie of our body, certes heauē is the countrie of our ſoule, frō vvhich ſhe is by creation deſcēded: and to her the vvholle vvorld is a place of exile, the body is a priſon & in reſpect of her, euen in Inglād vvee are out of our countrie, heauen only is our home. And vvho ſo vnwiſe, that would not chaunge the narrovv countrie of the body, for ſo large dominions in heauen to vvhich England is no countrie but a cottage, yea to vvhich the wholle globe of the earth is but a point and center in that circumference? hovv many Princes and Princeſſes haue left thir natiue countries, for a temporal Kingdom? hovv many Philoſophers yea hovv many trauellers haue left thir countries, not for heauen but only for curioſitie? And ſhal vvee thinke it ſo much to leaue England, yea the vvholle vvorld for heauen? Shal it greeue vs to diſmember our ſelues from England, to incorporate our ſelues mēbers of the Church militant in earth, and herafter of the Church triomphant in heauen? Let vs rather bevvaile the lamentable ſtate of our countrimen at home, vvho in their ovvn countrie are baniſhed the Church of God, and liuing at home, liue vnder the forrain Prince of Darkenes, in Thraldom of ſinne and hereſie. Out of our countrie vvee reape theſe commodities, vvhich England doth noth afford vs. Vvee ſerue God freely, wee

enioy libertie of our conſciences, and free exerciſe of our Religion, vvee heare noe blaſphemies againſt God, his Church, and his Saintes, vvee ſee noe Aultars throvvn dovvn, noe Monaſteries ruinated, no Churches defaced, noe holy veſſels prophaned, no Images nor Croſſes broken, no violent handes layed on the annointed Prieſts of God, vvee ſee noe heretical Synagogues, no Miniſters, nor falſe preachers. And although vvee are not choſen for the field and cõbat, yet vvee haue the honor the keepe to baggage and ſome of vs to vitaile the campe and to furniſh the fighting ſouldiours vvith al ſpiritual ſenſe and armour and ſo expect our parte vvhen the ſpoiles ſhalbe parted: and wee are ready alſo to enter the field when your General Chriſte ſhal call vs, and there to ſign that faith vvith our bloud, vvhich here vvee profeſſe by baniſhment, and teach by our bookes and vvritinges.

10. I come laſt to you, vvho yet are firſt in dignitie (O deſigned Martyrs) to vvhom I vvill vſe no other vvordes, then vvhich *Tertullian* vſed to your ancient Prædeceſſors. *Inter Carnis alimenta (Beneducti martyres deſignati) qua vobis & domina mater Eccleſia, de vberibus ſuis, & ſingula fratres de operibus ſuis proprijs, in carcerem ſubminiſtrant, capite aliquid & a nobis quod faciat & ad ſpiritum educandum: Amongeſt the nutrimentes of the fleſh (O bleſſed deſigned Martyrs) Which both our miſtreſs and mother the Church from her breſtes and treaſures, and euery one of our brethren of their proper labours, do miniſter vnto you in priſon, receiue you ſome thing from vs alſo, that may ſerue to feed the ſpirit.* And although to perſiſt in this autours

Tertul. Exhort ad martyres.

vvordes, *tantus non ſim vt vos alloquar*, I am not ſo great as vvho may addreſſe my ſpeech to you, yet not only the præfectes and maiſters of the Theatre, do exhort the Champiõs, but alſo they that ſtand a farre of, by their acclamations do excite and encourage them. Be not ſorie then, my conſtante brethren, that by ſentence vvhich is pronounced, you are adiudged to death, for you are going to the iudge vvho will reuerſe ſuch ſentences, and make you iudges of your iudges. Bee not ſorie to leaue this vvorld, vvho no ſoner entered it, but renounced it. leauing this home of your bodie, you retourne to the countrie of your ſoule, *vbi charorum numerus vos expectat*, vvhere ſo many *Albanes*, *Edmundes*, *Edvvardes*, *Thomaſſes*, the ancient Saintes of our countrie, yea where ſo many *Fiſhers*, *Mores*, *Maines*, *Campians*, *Brianes*, *Shervvines*, and other your louing brethrẽ expect you, Chriſte him ſelfe is ready to imbrace you, præpareth cloothes of immortalie to inueſt you, and holdes a diadem of glorie in his hand to crovvn you. *Timebit forſitan caro* (ſaith Tertullian) *gladium grauem, & crucem excelſam &c.* The fleſh perchaunce vvill feare the heauy ſvvord, the high gibbet, the drayled hirdle, the ſtrangling coard, the butchering knife: *ſed Spiritus contraponat ſibi & carni, accerba licet iſta, a multis tamen equo animo excepta &c.* but let the Spirit propoſe to her ſelfe, and the fleſh, hovv al theſe thinges though indeed terrible and cruel, haue of many been vvillingly receued; hovv many not only men but vvomen, yea maydes and children haue ſuffred al theſe thinges ioyful-

Tertul. exhort ad martyr.

ly for Christes sake: yea hovv many haue been put to as cruel deathes, yea haue as cruelly handled themselues, vvithout al hope of revvard. Feare not this combat and conflict, as it is the terribleſt, ſo it is the laſt, and the honorableſt that vvas euer foughten. The manhood, the aduerſaries, the dexteritie, the cauſe, the field, the armour, the ſpectatours, the revvard, the revvarder, and vvhat ſoeuer graceth a combat, are eminent in this yout conflict. The greateſt mãhood and fortitude that can bee, is here ſhevved; bicauſe at one tyme you vvraſtle vvith death, the vvorld, the deuil, your ſelues, the moſt potent aduerſaries that are. your dexteritie, is the ſubtilitie of the Serpent, for you expoſe the vvholle body to ſaue the head, that is Chriſte. your faith, your ſoule, vvhich ſaued, nothing cã be loſt. your cauſe is the iuſteſt and the nobleſt that can bee, Chriſtian faith, the Church, Chriſte. The field is the Church of Chriſte, in vvhich and for vvhich ſo many martyrs haue ſo couragiouſly fought & conquered. The armour is not made of iron or ſteele, but of faith, hope, charitie, grace and iuſtice, by vvhich the ſpirit is armed. The Spectatours, are the Saintes and Angels vvho by their acclamations ſecond the fight, and confort the champions: the revvard is the Kingdom of heauen and æternal felicitie: the reVarder is Chriſte, vvho as he fighteth in you, ſo in your victorie (as *S. Cyprian* ſaith) he crovvneth and is is crovvned, and he revvardeth, and is your revvard. No vvraſtlinges in *Olympus*, noe conflictes in the Romain Theatre, comparable to this combat, noe ſpe-

ſtacle like it. To ſee a *Stephen* in a ſhoure of ſtones, an *Ignatius* in the Theatre cõpaſſed vvith liõs, a *Laurence* lying on the *Gridiron*, a *Pelagia* ſinging *Te Deum* in the burning *Phalaris*, a *Tiburtius* vvalking on the glovving coales as on roſes, a *Peter*, or an *Andrevv* hanging on the croſſe, a Prieſt, Ieſuit, or Catholique, ſtretched on the racke, or vnbovvelled & opened vnder the gibbet, vvhat a ſpectacle is it? The tormentor threatneth, the martyr feareth not, he promiſeth life & honors, the martyr contemneth, he reuileth, inſulteth, the martyr prayeth, hee ſyveateth and tormenteth him ſelfe in tormenting, the martyr ſhrinkes not, he heapeth paynes vppon paynes, the martyr redoubleth his patience, he loſeth force, the martyr gathereth ſtrength and courage, he is ſtronger in the outvvard combat fought by the body, the martyr naked in body, but armed in ſpirit, is ſtronger in the inVard fight acted by the ſpirit, and ſo he foyleth the martyrs body at his feete, the martyrs ſoule foileth him, and leauing the body departeth maiſter of the feeld, and conquerour of the perſequutor, and of the deuil his maiſter, and of the World and fleſh his aſſiſtauntes. O happie martyrdom, noe death but a nevv natiuitie and Baptiſm. So Chriſte, ſo the Fathers cal it. By Baptiſm you vvere waſhed in cold vvater at your firſt entraunce into the vvorld, by martyrdom in your vvarm bloud at your departur from the vvorld: by baptiſm you vvere born to the Church militant, by martyrdom to the Church Triumphant, and that makes you members of the Church, this makes you Citizens of

Mar. 10. Tert. li. de Bap. Cipr. l. de laude Mart. Ambr. ſer. 1. in pſ. 118. Aug. ep. 18. Hieron in cap. 4. Epheſ.

heauen: Baptiſm vvaſhed you from al ſinne and pain due to ſinne, ſo doth Martyrdom, and therefore, ſaith *S. Auſtin iniuriam facit Martyri qui orat pro Martyre, he doth iniurie to a Martyr, vvho prayeth for a Martyr:* Baptiſm imprinteth an indelible caracter, by vvhich Chriſtians ar diſtinguiſhed from not Chriſtians, Martyrdom marketh you vvith a ſpiritual crovvn called *aureola Martyrum*, by vvhich you ſhal bee knovvn and diſtinguiſhed for euer, from al other Saintes in heauen: Baptiſm repreſenteth Chriſts death and reſurrection, becauſe the infant plunged in the vvater dieth to ſinne, and is lifted vp to the life of grace, Martyrdom is not only a repreſentation, but alſo an imitation: In Baptiſm, others profeſſed faith for you in vvordes, in this you your ſelues do it in vvord and deed: In baptiſm you profeſſed your faith before the Prieſt vvithout daunger, in Martyrdō you profeſſe it before the Tirant with hazard of your life: In baptiſm you renounced the world and deuil by promiſe, in Martyrdō by perfourmāce: Baptiſm gīues grace by wh^ch you may ſtand, Martyrdō ſo cōfirmes you that you cā not fal: that can not be reiterated, nether can this bee repeated: after Baptiſm, Pœnaunce for them that ſuffer Shippvvracke by ſinne, is neceſſarie, as a ſecond Table or Shipbord to eſcape by: after Martyrdom you need no ſuch remedie, bicauſe Martyrdom puttes you in the hauen yea on the ſhore, vvhere is noe feare of Shipvvracke: through the vvater of Baptiſm you paſſe to the Church militant, through the red ſea of Martyrdom in which Pharao and his armie, the deuil

Aug. ſer. 17. de ver. Apoſt.

and his complices are drovvned, you passe to the land of promise and Church Triumphant: by Baptism you dy to sinne and are borne to grace, by Martyrdom you dy to the vvorld, and are borne again to glorie. O glorious cõbat, ô death no death but a nevv natiuitie, not to a mortal, but an immortal life. So glorious a thing is Martyrdom, and so great a testimonie and honor of the Church, that the *Montanistes*, *Donatistes*, *Circumcellions*, and other heretikes haue affected it. Our Martyrmonger Fox hath displaced the ancient true Saintes and Martyrs, to make place for his nevv yet Stinking Marryrs: and to make a nũber, he hath coupled diuers sectes together, as *Lutherianes* and *Zuinglians*, vvho condemned one another to Hel, yea he ioyneth Catholiques vvith heretikes, and the liuing vvith the dead, and so vvil put them in one calendar and make them members of one Church Triumphant, vvhom one Church militant could neuer contein. But vvould they neuer so fayne they can not haue this glorie; for out of the Church ther is no charitie, and vvithout charitie, ther is no martyrdõ: & martyrs being vvitnesses, as the greeke vvord importeth, hovv can they bee true martyrs hauing subscribed to heresie? They may bee martyrs of the deuil, but not of Christe, they may bee killed but they cã not be crovvned, and that death may be a iust punishment, of their perfidiousnes, but no crovvn of glorie. Happie then, and three thousand tymes happie, O glorious Church of Ingland, vvho by martyrs bloud art thus purpled and adorned. Thou Wanteſt nether

ex Tert. li. de fuga. Euſ. l. 5. ca. 16. Aug. her. 69. Alano copo. Dial. ex libr. Trium. conuerſ. Angliæ.

ex Cipr. li. de ſimplic. Prælat. paciano ep. 2. ad Sympr.

Cipr ep. ad Mart.

lilies of Confessors, virgines, and holy Christias, nor roses, of martyrs to set forth thy beautie. Euerie Catholike in England may make him selfe a crovvn ether of the lilies of chast and exemplar life, or of the roses of purple death and martyrdomes.

11. But as vvee are called to an high dignitie, in that vvee are called to suffer for Christe and his Religion, so let vs so direct our liues, as they may be answverable to our calling and Profession. As the devves and raynes do fall most frequentlie in the night, so Gods graces do rain most abundauntly in the night of persequution. And therfore in tyme of persequutiō the life of Christians vvas euer most exemplar: as vvee reade in *Eusebius, Tertullian, Athenagoras, Iustinus martyr, Minutius*, and others vvho haue vvritten Apologies for the Christians innocencie and dedicated them to their Persequutors. *Tertulian* describing their prayer and modest bāquetting saith; before vvee tast our meates, vvee take a tast of prayer, vvee eate as much as men that still are hongrie, vvee „ drinke, as much as is profitable for them that li- „ ue chast, So vvee fill our stomakes, as vvee re- „ mēber that vvee must rise to pray at midnight, so „ wee talke & deuise as vvhoe know God heareth „ al, vvee sing psalmes and prayses to God, & ther- „ by declare hovv much euery man hath dron- „ ken; prayer endeth our banquet as it begun it, „ the very name of our banquet, argueth that vvee meet rather for pietie and charitie then good cheare, for it is called ἀγάπη that is, dilection. much more he addeth of the afflicted Christians cha-

Euseb. lib. 2. hist. cap. 17. & lib 3. in initio. Tert. in Apol cap. 39. Iust. orat. ad Ant. Minut. in Octau.

chastitie, charitie, almesdeeds. let vs then my bre- Tert. in
thren vvho are persequuted for the same cause Apol. cap.
that they were, lead the like life that they did. He- 42. 44. 45.
therto, thankes be to God, th' aduersarie giueth
you the good life, and therfore suspecteth them
for Papists vvho are chast in vvordes, modest in
behauiour, vpright in dealing, deuout in pra-
yer, continevv this opinion, that the aduersaries
may bee allured to your faith by the good odour
of your vvorkes. let the prisons svvarm, let the,
as *Tertulian* sayth, bee hoate with numbers of ma- Apolo 44
lefactours vvith Protestats; let no Catholike bee
found there, vnlesse it bee because he is a Catho-
like. Certes it is as absurd, that you in this tyme
especially of persequution, should not bee holy
in al conuersation, as that gold vvhich is in the
fier should not be pure from drosse, or that the
iron vvhich is often filed should not be bright
and smothe, or that the corne vvhich is threshed
and vvinowed should not bee purged from the
chaffe, or that the vine or tree pruned should not
beare grapes or fruites, or that the camomile
trodden should not grovv thicker, or the spice
punned, should not sauour svveeter.

Aboue al thinges I commend vnto you chari- Io. 3.
tie, for as Christe sayth, *in this you shalbe my disciples,* Tertul.
*if you loue one another.* The Christians of *Tertullians* Apol. c. 39.
tyme (vvhich vvas a tyme of persequution) vvere
so louing, so officious, so hospital, and charita-
ble to one another, that the paganes noted it, say-
ing, *vide vt inuicem se diligant, & pro alterutro mori pa-*
*rati sunt, see how they loue one another, and are ready to*

*dy fro one another*: let the Protestantes, note you of the same vertue. *do not the deuil* (to vse stil *Tertulians* vvordes) *that pleasure, as to permitte him to set you one against another, let him alwayes find you armed vvith concord, your peace vvaite vvarre to him.* In the Arke of Noe beastes of sauage and contrarie natures agreed, and you hovvsoeuer you might differ or iarre before you entred the Arke of the Catholique Church, must novv lay a side al cõtentions, as one faith linketh your vnderstandinges, so let one charitie couple your vvilles. As in the building of *Salomons* Temple, there vvas hard noe noyse of hammers: so in the reparation of our Church of Ingland which vvee al endeuour, let no noyse of contentions be hard amongest vs, let vs ioyne labours, industries, bloud and life, in this cause, and though vvee may differ in the meanes, yet let vs not be contrarie. In building of an hovvse the masons hevv the stones, the carpenters prepare the tymber, and so though different in meanes, yet they helpe one another, and the vvorke goeth on; but as if the masons should hinder the carpēters, they should be cõuinced not to intend the building, but contention, so if you take contrarie meanes and oppose your selues etch one to the others indeuours, you may ruin by contention vvhat hetherto by peace hath been builded, but you shal never accomplish the building. Vvherfore my honorable brethern, *loue peace, keepe fraternitie*, in many bodies bee you *one hart and one soule*, as the first Christians vvere. One faith illuminateth your vnder-

3 Reg. 6.

Act. 4.

standinges, one charitie animateth your vvilles, you are members of one Church militant, you hope to bee also of one Church Triumphat, you participat of the same Sacramentes, you eate the same body and drinke the same bloud of Christe, you intend the same conuersion of your countrie, you suffer the same, of the same, and for the same, the same miseries (vvhich fellovvship reconcileth deadly enemies) for the same cause, of the same aduersaries. In so many aggreementes, vvhat place can be for iarting? This I say, not as though I esteemed no charitie to bee amongest you (for I admire certes your hospitalitie to Priestes vvith hazard of your liues, your charitie to the imprisoned, you being already by mulctes and confiscations, and begging of liuinges so impouerished) but because I vvould haue it to continevv, and vvould feed this fier, vvhich Christe came to enkindle amongest you, vvithout the vvhich, faith is dead, martyrdom profiteth not, almesdeedes are but casting avvay of meny. 1. Cor. 10. 1. Cor. 13.

12. And if in our liues and conuersation, our aduersaries fynd nothing reprehensible or punishable, if your seruice and comportment to our Prince and soueraing be such as becometh loyal subiectes, if our charitie towardes our Catholike brethren, yea towardes our ennemies bee sincere and Christian and yet must be persequuted for our conscience and Religion, vvelcom and thrise vvelcom for this cause what soeuer persequution: In these miseries do duvel, felicitie, merit, and perfectiō, for this cause, landes, liuinges,

liberties, liues though they vvere a thousand, are vvell bestovved, vvhat soeuer vvee loose for this cause, it is not lost, but gained, it is but layed out to bee receaued again vvith vsurie. If not vvithstãding our so many offered oathes of our loyaltie & fidelitie, vvherwith the Kinges of England hertofore held them selues secure and cõtented, and the Kinges of Fraunce, and Spain, and al other Princes are to this day satisfied, new oathes which our consciences can not brooke, must be forced vppon vs. If not vvithstanding so many humble, supplications for our libertie of conscience, and free practise of our Religion, in lieu of libertie, vvee must be pressed vvith a longer seruitud: If our deare countrie vvill be still cruel against her ovvn children and bovvels, and for that Religion to vvhich shee vvas first conuerted, vvill take that life from them vvhich she gaue them. If not vvithstanding so many cryes and grones vnder this so heauie yoke of persequution, vvee can moue noe compassion: If so much bloud spilled can not coole the heate of our persecutors anger, nor assvvage their furie: If not vvithstanding so many handes lifte vp in prayer, euen in prisons and dungeons, if not vvithstãding so many sacrifices offered, so many liues sacrificed to reconcile God to our countrie, and it, to him and his Church, heresie must still domineere, the Catholike fayth must be kept vnder, Catholikes must bee oppressed, and so seuerly and incessantly persequuted: let vs commit our case and cause to God, vvho novv seeth it, and

vvil one day discern and iudge it: & let this bee our confort, that our enemies are no ſtronger, then vvere their prædeceſſors, vvee noe vveaker (if vve vvil) then our former bretheren, our liues no better, our cauſe no vvorſe, they can do no more then God ſhal permit, and he vvil permit noe more then vvee ſhalbe able to beare: And vvhen they haue done al they can, noe *Herod* can kil Chriſte, noe *Pharao* cā extirpate the true Iſraëlites, noe gates of hel can preuaile againſt the Church, noe flud of perſequution can drovvn Noes Arke. If in the verie infancie, no *Tiberius* no *Nero*, no *Domitian*, no *Diocletian*, no *Simon Magus*, no *Ebion*, nor al the heretiques that euer vvere could ouercome this Church, much leſſe after ſixteen hundred yeares, can any King or Counſel of Ingland, any ſect of *Luther* or *Caluin*, prævaiil againſt it: If this faith vvhen it vvas but a ſparkle could not be extinquiſhed, much leſſe novv after it is grovvn to bee a fier vvhich hath inflamed the vvholle vvorld. The Church *S. Leo* telleth vs, is not diminiſhed by perſequutiō but increaſed, the more, ſaith *Tertulian*, Wee are *cut and mowed, the more vvee are multiplied, becauſe the bloud of Martyrs, is the ſeed of many moe Chriſtians*, the more crueltie is vſed againſt vs ſaith *Iuſtinus martyr, the more do profeſſe pietie and faith in Chriſte, euē vvhen as by pruning, the vine is prouoked to greater fruteſulnes.* The old perſequutors of the Church, are dead, rotten, forgotten, ſhe ſtandeth ſtill on a rocke alvvayes the more glorious, the more ſhe is aſſaulted; and the late perſequutors of our Church, of Ingland

Leo ſer. de natural. Apoſt.

Tert. apol. cap. vlt.

Iuſtinus Dial. cum Triphon.

are summoned and called to account, & as must also they, vvho nowv supply their places. Shee is nowv more renowmed in her Priests, more glorious in her martyrs, more multiplied in her numbers, as constant in faith as euer, as ready and vvilling to suffer for it as euer.

Tour

MATTHEVV KELLISON.

Leo ser. de nativ. Apost. Tert. de præscr. adv. hær.

Iustinus Dial. cum Tryphon.

# THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

ALL disputation is vain (most louing Reader) vvhere there is not some iudge to determin, or some principles agreed on; for if the Respondent may stil deny vvhatsoeuer the disputant opposeth, and no iudge be to decide, nor principles bee agreed on, vvhich can not be denyed, the disputation vvil run on in infinitū, or end only in contention. Vvherfore the Philosopher sayth, that he that denyeth, the principles of Philosophie, to vvit, The vvholle is greater then parte therof, those thinges vvch are equal to a third, are equal amōg the selues, and such like, is not to be counted with arguments, but to be driue out of the Schoole, vvith blovves and buffettes. And yet thus is our case vvith the reforming, or rather deforming preachers. To haue greater scope to vvrangle, and more libertie to dogmatize and preatch vvhat they list vvithout al controlement, they haue reiected al iudges, and denyed al principles of Christian Religion. The Church and her generall Councels confirmed by the supreme visible Pastour hath hetherto been counted by al the ancient Fathers a lavvfull iudge, and by thir authoritie al heresies haue been condemned, al controuersies composed. The reformers of this age, refuse to stand to this iudges arbitrement, and if you alleadge any definition of any Councel or Pope, they vvil not obey th'authoritie, if

Iren. l. 3 c. 3. Athan. ep. ad Epict Aug. ep. 48. l. 2. de hæres. in fine. de vtil. cred. c. 7. 14. lib. 1. cont. Cresc. c. 33. Prosper li. de promiss. & prædot. c. 1. Naz. l. 1. Theol.

the definition be contrarie to their doctrin. And therfore Luther reiecteth a thousand Churches if in his opinio they disagree from Scriptur, and Caluin vvil examin al Councels by the vvord: and so they determining, vvhen the Councel determineth conformably to Scriptur, do pronounce sentence in the Councels sentence, and make them selues the Councels Iudges. Like vvise it hath hetherto been counted a principle infallible that the Church being the Pillar of truth, gouerned by Gods Spirit, builded on a rocke so firmly that the gates of hel can not preuail against her, can not erre in faith: and therfore S. Austin holdeth it to be most insolent madnes to dispute against that vvhich the Church holdeth; so do th' alleaged fathers. Our aduersaries stand to it, that the Church and General Councels may erre. Another Principle as leſt infallible is Tradition receiued generally in the Church and deliuered from age to age, by vvhich Irenæus, and al the Fathers vsed to confront al heretikes. This also is reiected. Vvho then shal moderat our disputation? Scriptur say they, but this vnleſs some Iudge determin of it, is no infallible principle. Because although amongest Christiās it be receiued for an indubitable maxime, that Scriptur in the true meaning can not deceiue vs, yet by Scriptur vvee can not know vvhich is scripture, nor vvhich is the meaning as I haue proued in my Suruey, & Reply, neither is Scriptur any Iudge but a lavv, vvhose meaning is ambiguous and obscure & therfore hath euer serued al heretikes, vnleſs some other Iudge determin of the meaning. Vvherfore the Iudges and Principles by me alleaged, being once reiected, marke I pray you vvhat childish disputatio vvee shal haue. Let me alleage S. Iames his epistle, to proue that faith vvithout good vvorkes doth not iustifie & that by good vvorkes vvee are iustified: let me proue out of

Luth. epist. Regem. Angl. Calvin lib. 4. Inst cap. 9. §. 8.

1. Tim 3. Io. 16. Mat. 16.

Aug. ep. 118. lib. 3. cont. her. c. 3.

See book first chap. 3.

*the second of the* Machabees, *that vve may pray for* 2. Mac. c.
*the dead, and that the Saintes pray for vs: they vvil deny* 12. & 15.
*these, and other bookes to be Canonical, and so vvil go from*
*their Iudge, and be his Iudge at their pleasur, iudging vvhether he be a true Iudge, that is true Scriptur. If they accept of the bookes and letter of Scriptur, yet vvil they appeale from it also to their ovvn interpretation, at their pleasur. As for example. They admit the fovvre Ghospels for Canonical Scriptur, and if I, out of S. Matthevv, prove that the* Eucharist *is Christes body because Christe sayed in expresse termes,* This is my body, *they leave the Iudge of vvhom* Mat. 26.
*they accepted, and fly to their ovvn interpretation, saying, the sense is this,* This is a figure of my body. *If I allege these plain vvordes of S.* Ihon, Vnles a man be Io. 3.
born again of vvater, and the holy Ghost, he can not enter the Kingdom of heauen: *and by them vvould prove that children can not be saued vvithout Baptism.* Caluin, *to maintein his singuler opinion, that chil-* Calu. l. 4. Inst. c. 16.
*dren of the faithfull are sanctified in their mothers vvomb* §. 23.
*by the faith of the parentes, and consequently may be saued vvithout Baptism, vvresteth, vvringeth, and transposeth the vvordes, putting the Spirit before the vvater, and confounding the vvater vvith the Spirit, as though this were the meaning,* vnlesse a man be born again of the Holy Spirit vvhich is a spiritual vvater purging from sinne and regenetating, he can not enter heauen. *and so contrarie to the expresse vvordes of Scripture, vvhich requireth, vvater and the Spirit, he vvil haue the Spirit only necessarie. Vvhat end or profit can be expected of such a disputation, but only contention and turning of our brayne* (as Tertulian saith) *vvith confusion, vvhilest vve shal vnderstand Scriptur in one sense,* Caluin *in another, and*

exposition shalbe opposed to exposition, and spirit to spirit, and conference of Scripture to conference, and no Iudge, nor Principle is to decide the controuersie?

Wherefore, my gentle Reader, I haue taken another way, and seing they deny all Iudge and common Principles of Christian faith, I haue in my Survey disputed with them, not of their owne Principles, which they graunt or cannot deny, as for example they can not deny that lawfull preachers must be sent, which principle I taking as graunted, do thence infere, in the first chapter of my first booke, that the Preachers of England are neither lawfull preachers nor Pastours, hauing neither mission ordinarie nor extraordinarie. They graunt, or cannot deny that breaking of the Church, rising after the Church, and faithplaited and reuolting from them, taking name of self-maisters, dissension in faith, condemned also by a generall Counsel, are and euer were reputed markes of heretiques, and that the true markes of the Church are One, Holy, Catholique, Apostolik: and so by the former markes I proue our Aduersaries to be heretiques, by the others our selues, whom they call Papistes, to be true Christians, and our Church the only Church of Christe: which I do in my second booke. In the third booke, out of their diuers opinions concerning Christe I proue in the first chapter, that Christe in their doctrin is neither man, nor God, nor borne of God, out of another Principle of theirs, to wit, that we are iust by Christes iustice imputed vnto vs: I proue in the same booke, that Christ according to their doctrin is neither Redeemer, nor spirituall Physitian, that operate as iust in vs, and out of other their Principles I haue deduced other absurdities, and so haue in eight bookes ruined the whole frame of their Religion, and that by so euident arguments, as the Iudicious reader will

confesse, that our aduersaries can neuer answer them, vnlesse they first recall and recant their owne Principles.

To this my Survey, One Matthew Sutcliff, who calleth him selfe Dean of Exceter, hath of late vpon a misse vpon answere, and published it in print, as a worke worthy to be vewed of the worlde, and consecrated to al Posterite. He entitleth his answer, The Examinatiō and cōfutatiō of a certeine scurrilous Treatise, entided the Survey of the new Religion: and in his Epistle dedicatorie, he calleth it, a Sober Answer to my virulent and percuse vinolent inuectiues. But of the scurrilitie of my booke, and the moderation of his, not he nor I, but the indifferent Reader, must be Iudge. Certes if he had left out al his lyes, raylinges, scoffinges, scoldinges, impudent facing, foolish obiections, and impertinent answers, his Answer had been only a booke of white paper, and yet might as wel haue born the Title, of an Examination and Confutation, as now it doth, because, as I haue shewed, he hath not refuted any one proofe or allegation, neither doth he come neere the answering of any one of my argumentes. And so he may be called Carnifex Papiri, as Illyricus calleth the Zuinglians, or miserabilis Librifex, as Luther called King Henrie the eight, and his booke may be titled a paper book blotted with Inke, but no Answer, Examination, or Confutation. For he seemeth to be in loue (as suum cuique pulchrum) with this and al other his bookes. In the Preface to the Reader he assureth him, that if he conferre his Answer to my Survey, he shal see the vanitie of my Accusation, and the Innocencie of their Doctrin. In the same preface hee bragges that he hath answered so sufficiently to Vvilliam Reynolds and D. Giffords Caluino-Turcismus, that D. Gifford re-

steth ether satisfied or silent. And in deed he is silent, and must be content vvher he can haue no satisfaction, but if he open his mouth, one blast vvulbe bastant to disperse al those idle papers. And as if a Whelp durst barcke at a Lion, in his 11. Chapter he makes his boastes, that in his booke de Missa against Bellarmin, his aduersaries cauillations are discussed, for any thing ether this doughtie Doctour of DoWaye, or Bellarmin can say against it. I haue seen ether his bookes against the booke of the three conuersions, and ether notable bookes of the same autour, and others, and if he bee in loue vvith them, I can assure him, that he is a true louer vvithout any riual. For al his bookes are one booke in substaunce, diuersly metamorphized and frayed out of the vvittes, that is, a hulke of lyes and raylinges against Popes, Priests, and Religious men, deuoid of al answvere. If he continevv his course of scribling, he may occasion some good bookes, discredit him selfe (as I heare he hath done amongest his ovvn complices) disgrace his ovvn cause, hurt ours: he can not by raylinges not seconded by reason: and therfore if I could beare any good Will to his Religiõ, I Would counsel him to leaue of this blotting of Paper, & to betake him selfe, to his Whinyard again. A. But vvhat vvould you haue the man to haue done? his stomake vvas replenished vvith euil humors, if he had not cast them, he had dyed: his head vvas great vvith child of these follies, and if he had not been deliuered, he had runne madde: and vvhilest he trauailed, his groues and trauelles seemed to promise some great and fayre barne, but it proued nothing but vvinde, vvhich he thought vvould haue blovvn dovvn Pope and Church, but in deed, vvas not able to shake a reed: he hath sowne many vvebbes but like to cob vvebbes, fitter to bee svvept avvay then to bee vvorn.

*And as* Midas *for his sentence which he pronounced as a Iudge amongest the Goddes, was rewarded with th' ornament of an Asses eares; so he (as I heare) expected a Rochet for his bookes in which he censureth Church and Religion, but certes deserueth some other ornament. For whereas hee thought vnder the veales of his Printed bookes to seeme a wise man worthy dignitie, his bookes proued nettes ful of holes, through which euery one sees his follie, yea glasses in which they see the perfect patern of a vvrangler. Whereas he thought by rayling and scoffing to disgrace me and other writers, wee tell him with* Seneca, that if Marcus Cato, or wise Lælius, or the other Cato, or the two Scipions, did speake ill of vs, it would moue vs: *but for his raylinges, they hurt vs not, because his wordes are no slaunder, and* iacula præuisa minus feriunt, *wee looked for no other entertainement, because wee knowe it is their maner.* Luther *in his bookes against King Henrie the eight,* Cocleus, Eckius *and others, yeeldeth common places of rayling.* Caluin *in his* Institutions, *calleth the Catholikes, almost at euery word* Canailes *knaues: and other scurrilities of him and other principal writers of the newe Church, I haue related in my third booke of this Reply.* Fulkes *contumelies against* D. Stapleton, *are related by the same Doctour in his Preface of his* defense of Ecclesiastical succession: *howe the same man reuileth that learned and modest man* Doctour Bristowe, *see in his* Reioinder *pag.* 95. *This newe Church began with rayling, and rayling must maintein it. Sotcliff, their Scholler is so expert in this art, that he seemeth at euery word almost, to play* Hercules furens, *and as* Luther *promiseth,* Lutherum habebitis vrsam in via, & leænam in semita, *you shal haue Luther a shee beare*

ex Cocleo in Actis Luth. an. 1523.

in the vvay, and a lioneſſe in the Pathe, ſo Scroſiff *promiſeth in his Aduertiſment in the end of his booke, that he and others vvill take another courſe, then the moſt deare ſeof* leuvel, *and others, that is a crow ſe of raylyng. But his rayling vvithout reaſon, is* vana fine viribus ira, vain anger vvithout ſtrength, *and as ſhevv an euill vvill vvithout povver to effectuate it, is meere follie. For as Bias ſaith:*

Quod prudentis opus? cum poſſis, nolle nocere.
Quid ſtulti proprium? non poſſe, & velle nocere.

5. *His manner of anſvvering is not ordinarie. Some tymes he carpes at by ſpeeches, and vvhen he comes to the driſt of the argument, either he paſſeth it vvith ſilence, or only denyes the concluſion. and ſo he fighteth as the vvrake out of breath doth, vvhoſe fight conſiſteth moſt in hiding his head, and running avvay. Some tymes leauing mee, he faineth an Aduerſarie of his vvtes like to the Straavv-ſtuffed Turk at vvhich they ſhoote in games: making me to ſay nothing, or othervviſe then I do, that ſo he may anſvvere the more eaſilie, or haue the greater aduantage. Some tymes he playes* Will-Sommers, *ſtriking at me vvhen he ſhould defend him ſelfe, that is obiecting, vvhen his turn, is to anſvver. Some tymes vvhen he ſeeth he can not auoyd the vvordes, vvherevvith I charge* Luther, Caluin *and others, he faceth out the matter like a ſouldiour ſaying* But vvhat
pag. 55. if Caluin haue not theſe vvordes, doth not this Kelliſon abuſe his Readers patience? V\hat if vvee teach contrarie? *Some tymes he lyeth in his anſvveres ſo lauvdly, that hee may vvorthilie haue the vvhetſtone, and that ſo often (as I haue noted in their places) that no ſeuv ciphres vvill ſuffice to decipher them. But herein alſo he imitateth his Maiſters. For* Ihon Faber *hath noted*

*above an 150. lyes in Oecolampadius vvritinges:* Iohannes Drietenbergius *hath found out in* Luthers *vvorkes 874. lyes:* Thomas Murnerus *marketh 50. lyes in one booke vvhich* Luther *vvrote against the King of Ingland: of vvhich number, the last lye vvas this:* Ego quoque circumcirca dimicaui at nullius adhuc vtique me vllius mendacij arguere potest, I also haue fought (by vvriting) round about, and yet no man could euer accuse me of a lye: *vvhich seemed so huge a lye, that this autour crovvned it, vvith a crovvn made ouer against it in the margin. And in* Luthers *German Translation of the Bible, there vvere espied aboue a 1000. errours and corruptions. As touching my Aduersaries stile and dexteritie in vvriting, I may say of him as* S. Hierom *did of* Vigilantius: Est quidem imperitus scientia & verbis, & sermone incondito, nec vera potest defendere. *Vvherfore some vvil mervvail vvhy I answered him at al, to Whom I answer, that it vvas not for that a Reply vvas necessarie, vvherein no answer vvas made, nor for that it vvas requisit for me to proue again vvhat I had auerred, he hauing not disproued any thing: but for the Readers good, this paines vvas taken, vvho thinketh, especiallie if he be of the vvlerneder sorte, that al is true that is published in printe, and that my Aduersarie might haue some reason, vvho stormeth so furiously and rayleth so impatentlie at mee, my booke and our Religion: yea it vvas for my Antagonistes good, vvho by this reprimande may take occasion of amendement, or may hence forth bee made to hold his peace, hauing spoken so litle to the purpose, so much to the preiudice of his own cause, and the offence of God and men. Certes, I protest that I haue neuer done this to reuenge my selfe of him, because I neuer counted*

ex Cocleo in Actis Luth. an. 1526.

Hieron. l. 1. cont. Vigil.

my selfe to haue receiued more iniurie then hurt, by his reuiling: yea if in any place of the world he should want my helpe, I would be ready to do him the pleasure, and to do his soule good, and to reclaime him from heresie, I would most willingly employ my labours, and hazard my life. Others will meruaile that I haue replyed so lately vnto him, he must be satisfied. The cause was, partely because it was long ere I came to the sight of his answer, partelie because when it came to my hands, it found my hands full of other busines, partely because I expected long a wiser answer which was sayed to be in hand, partely because, it was long before I could be perswaded to Reply, when I saw no answer but reuiling, and deemed it no honour to encounter with so weake an aduersarie and him so often foyled, whom to haue beaten, is but to foule my handes, and to ouercome is no victory. Others will demaund why I am soe large in Replying, if he answered so litle to the purpose? And to them also I will not let to yeild my reason. It was for the Readers good also. For as if I had only shewed where he sayled in answering, I might haue done that in fowre or fiue leaues: so such a Reply had been to litle purpose and as litle profit: wherefore I haue first set downe the summe of my argument, then his answer, then the Refutation. And in the Refutation I shew where he sayleth, I answer his obiections, and as occasion is offered, I refute pointes of his Religion, and proue pointes of ours which they haue called in question. In so much that ther is almost no pointe of the Catholike faith which is now in controuersie, which I haue not confirmed and cleared; ther is no pointe, almost of their Religion, which I haue not breefly, yet euidently refuted. yea as he hath giuen me occasion, I haue explicated familiarly many pointes of

Schoole

Schoole Diuinitie and Philosophie, especiallie in the Appendix to the third booke, vvhich I assure my selfe vvill not bee vngratefull. To his answver to my Epistles to the King, and Reader, I make no Reply, bicause he only either rayleth and carpeth at by-speeches, or else if he mentiun any matter of moment, it is answvered in the booke vppon other occasions. In his Answver to my Epistle to the King, he saith I make him an Idol, in saying that like a Neptun he is Lord of the Ocean Sea, he saith that Minutius hath not the vvordes I alleadge out of him, vvhich is true if he mean the Inglish vvordes, but he hath the substaunce of them in Latin related by Eusebius: he saith I bely Caluin, in lib. 4. cap. 9. saying that he teacheth that vvee are exempted from al povver of men, and that therfore vvee may disobey Princes lavves, vvhich yet he shal find verified in my sixt booke and first chapter. He accuseth me of the Gunpovvder Plotte, and other fooleries he hath, not vvorthy the repetition. Concerning his Scoffing it is neither agreeable to my natur, nor beseeming my calling, to contend vvith him in that kind, and therfore therin I yeeld vnto him, yet sometymes I repay him vvith his ovvn mony, but neuer but vppon iust occasion, that is either to shevv hovv foolish his argumentes are, or else to return his ovvn Scoffes on him selfe.

Receiue then my Gentle Reader this my booke, vvith as good a vvill as I giue it thee, and read it attentiuelie and vvithout passion, that thou mayst make that profit of it vvhich I vvish thee by it. In it thou shalt see the Clergie, Church, and Ecclesiastical gouernment and Religion established in Ingland quite ouerthrovvn, the Ca-

*tholique Clergie, Church, and Faith confirmed and cleared: that thou mayst fly from that, and fly vnto this, the only place of Refuge and Saluation. Pray for mee vvho vvill not cesse to labour, and pray for thee.*

* *
*

*MATTHEVV KELLISON.*

# THE APPROBATION of this Booke.

EGo Gulielmus Giffordius Presbiter Anglus, S. Theologiæ Doctor Facultatis Remensis, & almæ Vniuersitatis Remensis pro tempore Rector, attestor, me legisse hunc librum compositum à Domino M. N. MATTHÆO KELLISONIO contra Matthæum Sotcliffum sub hoc titulo, *A Reply to Sotcliffes answer, &c.* nihilq; inuenisse in eodem quod sanctam Fidem Catholicam, Apostolicam, Romanam, vel bonos mores offendere possit, quinimo eundem Matthæum Kellisonium docte, solidè, & piè dictam Fidem illustrasse, & hæreses contrarias confutasse, vt mereatur ab omnibus Catholicis legi, & in eum finem typis mandari. Datum Remis in Archimonasterio sancti Remigij solito residentiæ nostræ loco 4. Septembris Anno 1608.

*Ita attestor ego Gulielmus Giffordius Doctor & Rector qui suprà.*

Idem perlecto libro attestor ego infrascriptus sanctę Theologię eiusdem Facultatis Remensis Doctor, loco, die & anno quibus suprà.

*Rogerius Albanachius Presbiter Hybernus.*

VIsis atteſtationibus ſupraſcriptis doctiſſimorum S. Theologiæ Doctorum qui linguam Anglicam probè norunt, Librum aduerſus huius temporis hæreſes à D. Kelliſonio ſacræ Theologiæ apud Remos Doctore & Profeſſore ordinario compoſitum dignum eſſe cenſeo, qui ad plurimorũ vtilitatem maximam typis excudatur. Remis 6. Septemb. 1608.

*Ioannes le Beſgue inſignis Eccleſiæ Remenſis Canonicus, Pœnitentiarius, ſacræ Facultatis Decanus, Academiæ Cancellarius.*

THE REPLY

# THE REPLY TO SOTCLIFFES FIRST Chapter in vvhich he takes vppon him to answer the first book of the Suruey.

## KELLISON.

*The Title of the first book of the Suruey.*

THE first booke conteineth a suruey of the grounds and fondations of this nevv Religion, on vvhich it may seem to rely: which ether are the authoritie of their preachers, or the euidence of Scriptures, or their priuat Spirit, or credible and probable testimonies, or some visible Iudge who determineth of controuersies.

## Sotcliffes answer.

*IF it be the part of a vvise Builder to lay a firm fondation, as our Sauiour Christ Matth. 7. teacheth and common experience proueth most euidently vnto vs: then vve may vvel imagin, that Kellison our aduersary in his Survey, hath shevved him self nether vvise builder, nor vvise man, vvho in his first book going about to build the Tovver of his Romish Babel, doth vvholly mistake his fondations, laying the frame of his vvorke, ether vppon the Pope vvhom he supposeth to be a visible Iudge of al controuersies or vppon the Mission or preaching of Romish Massepriests, &c.*

## Kellisons reply.

Arist. lib. 3. Eth. c. 3.

THe Philosopher would say (and in this experience would second his Philosophie) that the thing, which is first in composition and doing, is last in dissolution and vndoing. For if you intend to build an howse, you must first lay the fondatiō, then raise the walles, and lastly set on the roofe: and if you would again dissolue this worke and ruinate this building, you must first take of the roofe, then cast down the walles, and lastly digge vp the fondatiō. But our Deane

Sorc'iffe, being ſkilful belike in Mines and vnder-earth workes, meaning to giue the total & ſodain ouerthrow of al this Booke and work, beginnes at the fondation, to wit the title of the firſt booke, vvhich as it is th'abridgment of the vvholle, ſo is it the ground work of the ſame. Yet as he ſayth *that it is the part of a vviſe Builder to lay a firm fondation*: So ſay I that it is no part of a wiſe man, to charge another with that fault, from vvhich him ſelfe is not free: for ſo the reproch redoundeth to the reprocher, and he in reptehending another, condemneth him ſelfe. *Loripedē rectus derideat, Æthiopem albus:* let the ſtrait limmed laugh at the cripple, and let the fair-complexioned, mocke the Ægiptian. And yet our *Sorc*: hath not the witte to be warie in that thing, of which he warneth mee, but is faultie in the ſame Kind in which he findeth fault, and is guiltie of the ſame crime, of which he pronounceth me guiltie. If this vvere al, it vvere not ſo much: for as the eye can as hardly ſee things to neare, as to farr of (bicauſe *ſenſibile ſuper ſenſum poſitum non facit ſenſationem*) and therfore can not ſee the moat that torments it: ſo vvee are eagle-eyed in diſcouering other mens faults, and blind in our own, bi-

Iouenal. Erasmi Adag. v. demiſo.

cause they are to near vs: but *Sotcliff* not only can not see his own fault (for which he might be excused by reason that this obiect is to near him) but also vpbraideth me with a fault, Vvhich not I, but he hath committed, and so redoubles th'iniquitie. For wheras I say in the Title, that *the first book conteineth a Survey of the grounds and fondations of this newe Religion, vvhich ether are the authoritie of their preachers, or the evidence of Scriptures, &c.* he saith, that I *going about to build the Towver of my Romish Babel do vvholy mistake my fondatiõs, laying the frame of my vvorke ether vppon the Pope, or vppon the mission and preaching of Romish Masse Priests*: and then he concludeth: *Vvherfore mistaking the fondation of the vvork, vve may vvel imagin, that his discourse that is a vvork raysed ether vvithout fondation, or beside the fondation, is most vain, idle, and absurd.* And yet it is not I, but he that mistaketh his fondation, standing, and state of the question: because in the Title, I speak only of the fondation and grounds of his, not of myn own Religion, my book being a Survey of his, not of my Religion. So that his discourse *is like to be most vain, idle, and absurd, being a vvork raysed vvithout or beside the fondation*: and this souldiour is like to giue a

weak assault, who runneth away before he striketh stroke, that is leaueth the state, and ground of the questiō, before he beginneth to dispute of the question.

2 Yet a litle after rubbing his brow better he somwhat remēbreth him selfe acknowledging that I talke of his Religion: *but yet do erre grosly in the fondation of it: supposing that it relyeth first vppō the authoritie of his preachers, thē vppon their allegation of Scripturs, thirdly vpon mens priuat Spirits, fourthly vppon credible or probable testimonies, and lastly vppon some visible Iudge.* But these grounds he saith, *are rather deuised by me then allowed by them*: as though he could name some other, and those, more assured grounds. And yet he neuer nameth any other, nether can he, nether could he peraduentur haue named these, if I had not named them for him. Yea afterward he saith his religion is *builded vppon the Prophets and Apostles*, that is (as he at least meaneth) vppon scripturs: and *the scripturs* (saith he) *vve receiue not as they are interpreted by the Masse-priests or any mans humorous fancy but as they proceed from the spirit of God by the ministerie of his Prophets and Apostles.* And so he alloweth two of the groundes by me mentioned, to wit scriptur, and th-

spirit (that is the priuat spirit, for he wil not admit the publique spirit of the Church as we shal see a none) which yet he sayd *were rather deuised by me, then allowed by them.* And in the progresse of his answer to my first book, he seeketh to maintein the other grounds; which he should haue rather denied then maintained, if he had not thought them to be some stayes & grounds for men in Religiō. & so he alloweth those grounds of Religion, which he sayed *were rather deuised by me then allowed by them.* What wil this Souldiour be able to do, think you, whē he commeth to assail the town and ramparre, who so fowly is foiled in the assailing of the raueling and counterscarpe? That is, how wil he be able to deal with the book it selfe, that can no better deal with the Title?

KELLISON.

## The some of the first Chapter.

*THis first chapter examineth the mission of the newe preachers of this tyme and proueth at large by Scriptures and reason, that none are to arrogate the office of preaching vnless they be sent and called ther vnto, and sheweth also howe it is the propertie of al false Prophets to run vnsent*

Nowv ther are but tvvo kind of callinges and miſ-
ſions. The one ordinarie, the other extraordinarie:
and both muſt be proued, elſe vve may admitt falſe
prophets for true and lavvful preachers: and the
ordinarie miſſion muſt be proued by ſucceſsiō as out
of Tertulian, S. Ciprian, S. Auguſtin and Optatus
yes and by reaſon is proued; The extraordinarie vo-
cation muſt bee declared by extraordinarie ſignes
and miracles. Elſe euery lacke may vaunt of his ex-
traordinarie calling, and nō man ſhal controll him.
The Reformers Miſſion is not ordinarie, bicauſe
Luther and the firſt of them had no predeceſſours
to vvhom they ſucceeded: nether is it extraordina-
rie, bicauſe Chriſt promiſed a continuance of his
Church and paſtours to the end, and ſo in the nevv
lavv vvee are to looke for no extraordinarie preā-
chers ſent immediatly from God: or if they vvil
claim an extraordinarie miſſion they muſt ſhevv
vs their miracles, vvhich as yet they haue not. To
ſay that they ſucceed to the Apoſtles and the firſt
Biſhops by interruption of ſome hundred yeares, or
that they had Predeceſſours and a Church inuiſible,
is reiected as an anſvver inſufficient. Hence I in-
ferre firſt that God ſhould be vnreaſonable if he
vvould bynd vs to receue Luther, Caluin and the
nevv preachers as lavvfull paſtours and preachers
bicauſe they can not proue their miſſion, and hee
hath fore-vvarned vs of falſe prophets vvho ſhal

*vun before they be ſent: and ſo in bynding vs to this hee might bynd vs alſo to receue a falſe propher. Secondly I conclude that if vve receue theſe nevv preachers vvho can not proue their miſsion, vvee bynd our ſelues to receue al falſe preachers, becauſe they alſo vvil ſay they are ſent, and ſo can not be excluded, if theſe men be receued.*

*Sotcliffes anſvver vvith the reply againſt it.*

TO this if *Sotcliffe* would haue anſwered in any good ſort, he ſhould determinatelie haue ſtood ether to an ordinarie or extraordinarie Miſſion, and then ſhould haue proued the ſame, and freed it from the
pag.2.l.14 obiections vvhich I had made againſt it: but he ſome tymes wil not haue Religion to depend on preachers, that ſo, if he fail in the proofe of his preachers Miſſion, it may not ſeem ſo material: then as loth to come to
2 pag.2.li. the defence of his ovvn Miſſion, he impu-
14. gneth with al his might and mayn, yet moſt weakly, the Popes and al Catholique paſtours miſſion, and ſo like *vvil Sõmer* ſtrikes at his next neighbour vvhen he ſhould de-
pag.3.li.2. fẽd him ſelfe: after this he auerreth his own Preachers Miſſion; yet to haue the more ſcope to eſcape, he will not determin vvhether it be ordinarie or extraordinarie: only

he ſaith that an ordinarie miſſion requires not of neceſſitie ſucceſſion, and that an extraordinarie miſſion, needs not to be proued by miracles. and ſo ſeems to make claim to both, that if he fail in one he may haue recourſe to the other: and to make his cauſe more eaſie, he vvill not be bound to any prooſes of ether vnleſſ it be by ſcripture: & ſo ſaying noe more for his miſſiō then alheretikes can doe, who can ſay they are ſent & alleage ſcripture for that they preach: If we receue *Sotcliffe* and his Miniſters, vve muſt admitte by the ſame reaſon tagg and ragg and al falſe Apoſtles, vnleſſ vvee will be partial. But leaſt that I may ſeem to do *Sotc.* iniurie, I vvil deſcend to more particulers and ſet dovvn his anſvver in his ovvn vvordes: and firſt his arguments againſt the Popes & and Catholike Prieſts Miſſion, then his euidence vv^ch he bringeth for his ovvn Preachers calling, laſtly his anſvvere to the drifte of my diſcours and argument. pag. 6. li. 9. pag. 7. lin. 34.

*Sotcliffes arguments againſt the Popes and Catholike Prieſts Miſſion, anſvvered.*

OVR Deane doubting that he ſhal neuer be able ether to diſproue the Catholike Preachers Miſſion, or to proue his 1

own, would fayn perſwade his Reader that Religion dependeth not on preaching: and that conſequently *my long declamatorie narratiõ* (ſo he termes it) *proving that no man is to intrude him ſelfe into the miniſterie without miſſiõ, is vain and friuolous. For vvhat is that* (ſaith he) *to the foundation of Religion? doth he ſuppoſe that the principal fondation of his Maſſing Religion is layd vppon the preaching?* No, *Sir Sotcliffe*, I do not deem preaching the principal fondation of Religion: for that is the *prime veritie*, and diuine authoritie, vvhich diuines cal the formal obiect and principal ground of faith: but yet I auouch that preaching appertaineth to the cauſe *proponent*: and ſo in reſpect of vs, is a ground of Religion, and therfore had need to bee authorized by proofe of the preachers Miſſion. For hovv ſhal vve come to the knovvledg of faith vnles ſome propoſe it or preach it vnto vs? and vvhat vvil it auail vs that it is propoſed, vnleſſ vve be aſſured of our preacher? and hovv ſhal vve bee aſſured of him, vnleſſ he proue his Miſſion? If faith depend not on Preaching, vvhy did Chriſt ſend his Apoſtles to preach and confirm alſo their miſſion by miracles? I graunt that faith is the guifte of God proceeding not only from our cooperatiõ, but

Faith depẽdeth of preachers.

Marc. vlt. Phil 1. Epheſ. 2. Concil. Arauſ. 2. can. 5. 7. Aug. li de prædeſt ſãct.

alſo frō his inſpiratiō, but yet before almighty God giues vs this inſpiration to beleeue, ſome preacher muſt propoſe vvhat vve are to beleeue, and therfore S. Paule ſaith that *faith comes* by hearing. Malachie ſaith vve muſt require the lavv at the hands of the Prieſt. And vvhy elſe did Chriſt plante a Church and eſtabliſh Paſtors and Doctors, vnto the end but bicauſe of thē vve ſhould learn vvhat to beleeue? I confeſſ alſo that our faith is principallie grounded vppon yᵉ Prophets & Apoſtles writings, vvᶜʰ are God his word, but how ſhal we know that theſe vritings are Gods vvord, or are thus to be vnderſtood, vnleſſ the Church and her Paſtours preach it or propoſe it? Certes as the Samaritanes beleeued in Chriſt and yet had not come to this beleefe, had not the Samaritane womā preached him firſt vnto them: ſo we beleeue al the articles of Chriſtiā faith bicauſe God hath reuealed, and authoriſed them by his diuine authoritie (for vvhich cauſe our faith is called diuine and not humain faith) and yet vvee had neuer come to this faith nor knovvledg of theſe articles, had not the Samaritane womā, the Church, by her Paſtours preached Chriſt and his myſteries vnto vs. And therfore S. Auſtin

Ro. 10.
Mal. 2.
Ephes. 4.
Ephes. 2.
Ioan. 4.
1. cont. ep. fund.

vvho beleeued the vvord of God and the articles of Christian faith for the diuine authoritie, yet saith, that he vvould not beleeue the Ghospell if the authoritie of the Church did not moue him therunto. And if it seem foolish to our *Sotcliff*, that faith should depend of men, or Scriptur of the Church. I answer that as Christe for him selfe depended not of men, his testimonie being greater then al humain authoritie, yet depended of S. Ihon Baptistes testimonie in respect of the Ievves to vvhom S. Ihon vvas better knovvn then Christe, and in respect of the Ievves and Gentiles depended also of his Apostles, by vvhose ministerie & preaching, the faith vvas made knovvn, so Scripture vvhich in it selfe is of more authoritie then al the testimonie of men; and faith also, vvhich hath Gods vvord and authoritie for her ground, fondation, and formal obiect; in respect of vs dependeth of Preachers (reuelations being not ordinarie) and not only of in vvard inspiration, but also of out vvard hearing. And so the preachers of vvhom by hearing vve receue faith must proue their mission: else (saith *Clemens Alexandrinus*) as the eared potte that is often caryed by the eare, at length looseth the eares,

Ioan. 5. Io. 1.

Act. 1.

Rom. 10. Aug tract. 5. in 1. ep. Ioan.

l. 5. Strom.

A similitud.

and is broken; ſo if vve vvill lend our eares to euerie improbable tale or prating preacher, vve ſhal looſe the right vſe of our eares, and make them paſſages for erronr and hereſie, vvhich ſhould haue been receptacles of faith and veritie. And ſo I handling the fondations of this nevv Religion, not vvithout cauſe did handle largely the Miſſion of their preachers, vvhich fondation being diſproued, the vvhole frame of their Church and religion falleth. Bicauſe faith depẽdeth of hearing, hearing of preaching, preaching of preachers, and preachers are not lavvfull vvho haue not a lavvful Miſſion. But novv let vs hear *Sotcliffes* arguments by vvhich he diſproueth the Popes and Catholike Paſtours miſſion. Miſſion to beproued.

2 His firſt argument which he counteth an *Achilles*, and therfore repeates it tvviſe, is this: *Vvee read Epheſ. 4. that Chriſt gaue ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, ſome Euangeliſts, ſome Paſtors, and Teachers. But the Pope is none of al theſe. His ſtate is to great to be conteined vvith in this ſmal and vveake number.* See here the pregnaunt vvit of a *Sotc*: This his argument is as good, as if a mã ſhould ſay: Ariſtotle hath comprehended al thinges in 10. Prædicaments, to vvit *Subſtantia, Quantitas, Qualitas*, pag. 2. pa. 8.

His firſt argument turned againſt him ſelfe.

*Relatio*, &c. But *Sotcliffe* is not named in any of these Prædicaments, *ergo* he is Transcendent & in none of al the Prædicaments. And if he answer that he is comprised with in the precincts of *Substãtia* vnder the *Genus Animal*: then vvil I answer to *Sotc*: that the Pope is comprehended by the Apostle in the vvord *Pastours*, vvhich comprehendeth *Popes* as vvel as Bishops and other Pastours. Yea his argument is not vnlike another in the same Mood and Figure. The Prophet *Daniel* in the Psalm *Benedicite* inuiteth al creaturs to bless and prayse God: but *Sotcliff* in that Psalm is not once mentioned, *ergo* he is none of the creaturs inuited. And if he or any wiser then he answer, that he may wel be comprehended in that verse of the alleged Canticle: *Bless ye al beasts and cattle the lord*: then vvil I answer as before, that the Pope is comprehended vnder the vvords Pastours, yea Apostles. Or if *Sotcliff* vvil needs haue an express mention, he excludeth him selfe and his Ministers for here is no expresse mẽtion ether of Deanes or Superintendents, *ergo* they are none of the *Apostles, Prophets, Euangelists, Doctours, Pastours, giuen to the consummation of the Saincts vnto the vvork of the Ministerie*, &c. Thus

Dan. 3.

Bern. l. 4. de consid. c. 4 6.

Ephes. 4.

vve see *Sotcliffes* argument turned against him selfe. But peraduentur his confirmation is better then the argument. *The Popes state* (saith he) *is to great to be comprehended in this smale and vveak number.* Now he playeth the *Arithmetician*, but so poorly, that euery Apprehentice in *London*, may teach him to Cypher. For the number of the Ministers of the Church, mentioned by the Apostle is *fiue*; but that (saith *Sotc:*) is to *smal and vveake to comprehend the Popes greatnes*: as though the number of fiue wer not as able to comprehend *Popes, Emperours, Kings*, and great Potentats, as poor and ragged Ministers. He vvil perchaunce answver, that although the number *fiue* be bigg enough, yet those fiue vvordes *Apostles, Prophets, Euangelists, Pastours, Doctours, are to smal & vveak* to compriſe the Popes Greatnes, vvho is novv greatned by tẽporal vvelth and splendour, and in this Kind is a Giant, in respect of the litle, lovv, and lovvly Bishops and Pastours, of vvhom the Apostle speaketh. But if these vvords, for this cause be to litle to contein the Popes Grandeur, then vvil it be hard for *Sotcliff* (as good an harbenger as he is) to find out room for him selfe and his Reuerend Fathers the superintendents,

His cõfirmation is infirmed.

bicause they al are vvaxen so Burlie, grosse and corpulent vvith Bishopricks, Deanries, and Benefices, that those fiue words put together (if by them we vnderstand such poor priests, pastours and doctours as the Apostles and their schollers at that tyme vvere) vvil not be able to contein one of them, especially vvith his vvife and children hanging vppon him. Yet if I proue that this tẽporal greatnes may consist vvith spiritual and pastoral authoritie, then (although I intẽd not therby to giue *Sotc*: & his ministers any place in that rãke of Prelates, bicause I shal anone exclude them for other causes) hath *Sotc*: no reason to exclude the Pope from that vvorthy rank by reason of his tẽporal riches. For Melchisedech was King and Priest, Noe, Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob, yea al the first born in the lavv of Natur, if vve beleeue saint Hierom, vvere Priests & temporal Lords: and Moyses as vve read in in Exodus, did the office both of a Prince and Priest, & therfor Philo calles him King, lavvmaker, high Priest, and Prophet. Hely also and the Machabees vvere Priests and Princes of the Ievves. Vvhy then in the lavv of Grace may not these tvvo povvers consorte in one person, seing that they repugne

Gen. 14.

In q. Heb. in illud Genes. 49. Ruben primoge. Ez. 28. 31. 40.

Philo l. de vita Moys.

1. Reg. 1. 4.

lib. 1. & 2. Machab.

Ioseph. l. 12. Antiq.

pugn not? The body and soule, though that be of a corpulent substaunce, this of a spiritual, can aggre together in one man, yea ma can not be vvithout them, vvhy then may not Spiritual and Temporal povver (that by S. Gregorie Naz. being compared to the soule, this to the bodie) sympathize in one person? And as the body is the organ and instrumẽt of the soule, vvhy may not Temporal povver serue the spiritual, and execute her præscripts and ordonãces? I graunt with S. Bernard that the Pope as Pope hath no Temporal Iurisdiction, his povver, as he is Pope, being only Spiritual; and I confesse that Christ gaue to S. Peter noe Kingdoms nor temporal States, but only comitted to him a Church to rule and *sheep to feed*. But yet as he gaue Peter and his successours noe temporal States, so he forbad them not to take them if they vvere offered. For so he gaue no vvordly riches to th' Apostles, and yet bicause he forbad thẽ not to take them, they receiued the goods vvhich the first Christiãs offered at their feet; and although Christ made nether the Apostles nor their Successors Beneficed men, yet their successors of long tyme haue enioyed benefices, grounding them selues on those vvords of

orat ad populum. tim. re perculsum.

l. 2. decr. fid ad Ro gen.

Io. 21.

Act. 2. 4.

Matt. 10. their Maister: *the vvork-man is vvorthy his*
1. Cor. 9. *meat*, and those also of his Apostle: *vvho feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk? If vve haue sovven vnto you spiritual things, is it a great matter, if vve reap your carnal things?* and again: *they that serue the Altar, participat vvith the Altar.*

3 Certes they vvho gaue or cõfirmed this temporal state to the Pope, vvere most Religious Princes, as *Constãtine*, the great, *Pipine*, *Charles* the Great, *Levvis* the Godlie: and they vvere holy Saints and learned men vvho accepted the guift, as *Silvester* vvho baptized *Constantine*, *Leo* the third, fourth, and ninthe, *Gregorie* the seuẽth, *Celestine* the fift, *Adrian* the first, *Nicholas* the first, *Innocentius* the third, and many others. This donatiõ is extant also in the priuelege of the Romain Church, in the acts of Silvester, and in the canon lavv in the chapter that beginnes *Constantinus*, which though it be noted with *Palea*, yet as appeareth by the notes vppon that chapter, it is to be fond in many exemplairs, and the Epistle to the Reader, before the Canon law set forth by Pope Gregorie the thirteenth, shevveth hovv many Chapters vvhich are noted vvith *Palea* are authentical and ancient. The same donation

Cap. Constantinus d. 96. Ado in Chron. an. 717. d. 63. cap. ego Lodouicus.

is mẽtioned by *S. Isidorus Hispalensis* vvhose vvords *Nauclerus* recyteth, by *S. Damasus* as euen the Magdeburgians confesse, and by *Calcondylas* a Greek autour. The same priuiledg of the Romain Church is confirmed by *Petrus Damianus, Anselm, Iuo Carnotensis*, and many other alleaged by *Genebrard, Bellarmin, D. Sanders, Iudocus Coccius*, & others: yea *Ammianus Marcellinus*, an Ethnike insinuateth the same, in that he complaineth of the Maiestie & riches of the Bishops of Rome, & euen our aduersaries the Ievves by murmuring at it do confirm it. *Abraham Ecuita* in his Iudaical Chronicle speaking of Constantine sayth: *Ipse exiit Roma, & dedit eam sacrificiis Idumæorum*: he vvent from Rome, and gaue it to the Priests of the Idumeans; so he called the Christians by contempt. *Rabbi Abraham Esra* speaking of the same Constantin, vseth these vvords: *decoruit locum Romæ quæ erat sedes eius, & reliquit eam iniquitati quæ vocatur Petrus*: he adorned the place of Rome, vvhich vvas his seat, and left it to iniquitie which is called Peter. And for this cause, as *D. Sanders* noteth, the Emperours neuer fixed their habitation at Rome (acknowledging it to appertain to y^e^ Pope) but either at *Constantinople*, or at *Milain*, or

Naucl. gener. 13 Cent. 4. c. 7. Calcond. l. 1. de gest. Turcar. Pet. Dam. disp. inter Reg. ad hoc. Anst. l. 4. c. 32. Iuo Carnot. p. 5 Decret. c. 49. Gen. l. 3 chron. in Syln. Bell. to. 1. l. de Roma. Poot. c. 9. Sand. l. 7. vis. mon. c. 90. Am. Marc. l. 27 apud Genebr. In cap. 11. Dan.

Ravenna. And if the Pope had not been lawful Possessour of Rome and other Territories, vvhy vvere Aistulphus King of the Lõbards, Henrie the fourth and fifte, Otho the fourth, Friderick the first and secõd condemned by al Hystoriographers, for depriuing or attempting to depriue him of his Temporal domains? Vvhy vvas not claim made vnto it for a *1000. yeares* byany show of right? And if the Pope purchased this state by the svvord, let our Aduersaries name the battailes he fought for it, and the Emperours vvhom he fought against. Yea let them tel vs how possibly he could come to it by force, vvho before he had it, *vvas but a poor Bishop*? But, be it that he had impatronised him selfe by force & tyránie, or by craft and Sutteltie: yet after so many hundred yeares of Prescription, to cal his Title in question is mear follie. For although the rule of the law saith that possessor *malæ fidei nunquam præscribit*, yet in Kingdomes and Empires it is not so: bicause those that enter Tyrantes, may by the expres or tacit consent of the Realm and people, proue true & lawful Princes: at least their Successors may, othervvise vve must cal the Title of the Kings of *Fraunce, England and Spayn* in que-

Ado. Vi. Cron. ann. 747. Bel. sept.

de reg. iuris in 6. & c. fin. de præscr.

ſtion; And yet not only the people of Italie haue receued by conſent the *Pope* as their temporal Prince, but alſo the Emperours *Pipine*, *Charles*, *Lewis*, and other Chriſtian Princes for many hundred yeares haue ratified it. Soe that I hauing proued that ſpiritual and tẽporal power may conſiſt in one and the ſame perſon, and that the Pope is lawfull Prince of his tempotal ſtate, it followeth that he is not to Great to be conteyned in the aforenamed ranke of *Apoſtles, Prophetes, Euangeliſts, Paſtours*, and *Doctours, vvhom Chriſt hath giuen to the conſummation of the Saincts vnto the vvoork of the Miniſterie vnto the edifying of the body of Chriſte, the Church.* Ephes. 4.

4 His ſecond reaſon is this: *Further he is no ſucceſſor of Peter, for he rather Killeth then feedeth Chriſts ſheep.* And my ſecond anſvver is, that if the Pope be not the ſucceſſour of Peter bicauſe he doth not the office of peter, vvhich *is to feed ſheep*: then is *Sot* no Doctour, bicauſe he doth not y^e office of a Doctour, vvhich is to diſpute and teach vvith reaſon. let this Doctour therfor learn, that the office and povver or authoritie is one thing, the exequutiõ of it is another thing, and ſo not to execute the office, is not to His 2. reaſon. Io. 21.

looſe the office: othervviſe Kings ſhalbe no longer Kings then they actually gouern as Kings, Captains no lõger Captains thẽ they fight in feeld, and Miniſters no lõger Miniſters, thẽ they preach or miniſter Sacramẽts, & ſo *Sotc.* vvhen he vvent with the Earle of Eſſex to Cales, tyed to a guilded rapier, vvas vndeaned and vn-Miniſtred, bicauſe he did not the office of a Dean or Miniſter, but only of a Souldiour, vvhich alſo he performed there ſo cowardly, that a Captain, whom he remembreth, vvas fayn to threaten him the *Baſtinado* for not marching forvvard. Yet tel vs M. *Sotcliff*: vvhy the Pope rather Killeth then feedeth Chriſts ſheep? Is it bicauſe he puniſheth, as a temporal Prince Chriſtiãs maleſactours? ſo Princes do and yet are lavvful Princes and Paſtours of the people, becauſe God hath put the ſvvord in their hands for that end. Is it bicauſe he condemneth heretikes, and deliuereth them vp to ſecular povver? heretikes are no Chriſtian ſheep, but vvolues: and ſo this is not to Kill Chriſts ſheep, but vvolues that deuour the ſheep. And hovv the pope doth this lavvfully, I ſhal declare in the ſecond booke. Or is it, bicauſe he killeth Chriſtians ſpiritually, by teaching them hereſie? If this be your

Sotcl. vn miniſtred.

Rom. 13.

meaning, then I must tel you that although the pope being a man as others are, may kill Christs shepp by euil examples, and although some Popes as priuat persons might hold some heresies (from vvhich fault notvvithstanding *Bellarmin*, and *Baronius* haue freed al the Popes, therof accused). Yet shal no man be able iustly to charge any Pope vvith teaching any heresie *ex Cathedra*, that is as a supreme pastour or Doctour, vvho not only telleth vvhat him selfe thinketh, but also vvhat he wil haue al others to beleeue if they vvil be saued. And the reason vvhy the Pope in this sense can not erre is this: bicause the Pope is the successor of Peter (as I haue proued in the sixt chapter of this first booke) and consequently he is the *rock* next after Christ vppon vvhich the Church is built, he is the pastour to vvhom Christ committed his sheep, and for vvhose faith he prayed: and so if he should totter in faith, the wholle frame of the Church should fal, and the gates of hel should preuail against this rock and Church. If he should teach heresie, he should not feed but poison the sheep and giue to the litleones *pro pisce serpentem* If he should teach her sie, Christs prayer

Horw the Pope can not erre.

Mat. 16. Io. 21. Luc 22.

Luc 11.

had not been hard, by which he prayed that his faith might not fail: and if he should erre the Church which followeth her pastour should erre, which yet is called the
1. Tim. 3. *piller of truth, and so the pillar* falling no truth in earth concerning faith should remain.

5. His third reason is as good: *Thirdly he rather meddleth with swordes then keyes, and if*
His 3. reason. *he handle the keyes of the Church yet can he shew no commission for it.* See how our *Sot*: in affirming, is as forward as a blind forhorse, and yet as slow as a snail in prouing: for he barely and bodily affirmeth, but nether proueth that he meddleth with swordes, nether that he should not meddle with keyes, nether doth he explicate what he meaneth ether by the one or the other. So that we must riddle his riddle and gesse at his meaning. It seemeth by swords he meaneth ye Popes temporal and spiritual power, for not only the instrument of punishement is called the sword, but also the power of punishing: and therfore the Schithiãs honoured the sword
Clem. ep. Hort ad geores Arnob l. 6. as God, because it is the Hierogliff of authoritie, which like a God ministreth iustice, by chastising and rewarding. If this be his meaning, he must be so good as to tel vs why he findeth fault with the Popes hand-

ling of ſwords? For as for his temporal povver ouer his temporal ſtate in Italie, that I haue already proued to be lawful: and beſide this ſword, it vvilbe hard for our *Sot:* to find another to make vp ſwords. True it is that he hath a ſpiritual ſword & power by which he ruleth the vvholl Church as I haue proued in the ſixt chapter: but that is ſo farr from preiudicing the Popes Miſſion, that it is the thing that makes him the lavvful ſucceſſour of S. Peter, ſent by a long line of ſucceſſion euen frō Chriſt him ſelfe, as herafter vve ſhal ſee. If beſide this ſpiritual povver vvhich he hath ouer the vvholl Church, *Sote:* ſuppoſe, that ether vve giue him, or that he chalengeth to him ſelf, any temporal povver ouer Chriſtian Kings and Kingdomes, he is fovvly deceued, for vve confeſs & ſo doth he, that Chriſt gaue him no ſuch ſvvord nor Soueraintie. So that ether our Deanes mouth ran ouer, vvhen he ſayed that the Pope *medleth vvith ſvvords*, or elſe he ſpake figuratiuely, vſing the plural for the ſingular. Vve acknovvledg in deed two ſvvords in the Church of Chriſt, the one ſpiritual, the other tēporal, *but vve giue them not both to the Pope.* For the ſuprem ſpiritual povver is the only ſvvord vvhich he hand-

The Pope hath but one ſvvord ouer al the Church.

The enemies of ciuil authoritie. Ioseph. l. 18. an. c. 2. Aug. l. 5. cõt. crese. c. 15. extra. de heret. c. 4. Antõ. 4 p. tit. 11. c. 7. § 9. luth. l. de secularí potest. Ex Bulling l. c. 8. fled in cron. lindan. in in dubitat. Cal. l. 4 inst. c 19. § 14. Sot. cap. 19. Buch l. de iure regni. goodm. book of obedience. pag. 203.

leth, the suprem temporal power out of Italie, pertaineth to the Emperour, Kinges, and Princes. Vve say not vvith *Iudas Galilæus*, that no Prince is to be obeyed not called Lord, but God: nor vvith *Cresconius* that the Magistrate ought not to punish malefactours; bicause God hath giuen them free-vvil: nor vvith the *Begards*, that the Perfect are freed frõ al humain authoritie: nor vvith *Vvicleph*, that the Prince by mortal sinne, cesseth to be Prince: nor vvith *Luther* that the Turk is *decies probior prudentiórque quam nostri Principes*, ten tymes honester & vviser then our Princes: nor vvith the *Anabaptists* and *Libertins* that the People oweth no obedience to Magistrates and Princes: nor with *Caluin* that faithful cõsciences are exempted from al mens power: nor with *Sotcliffe* that Princes lavves do only then bynd in conscience, when they command or forbid that vvhich otherwise is commaunded or forbidden in Gods vvord: nor vvith *Buchanan* that the people only is to make lavves *Reges sunt velut Tabulariorum custodes*, Kings are as it vver Maisters of the Rolles: nor vvith *Goodman* that vvomen can not raign, and that *Vviat* rising against Queen *Marie* vvas no Traitour. But vve say: *Thou shalt not de-*

Exod. 22.

*tract from the Gods nor curse nor speake euil of the Prince of thy people*: Vve say, that *by God Princes raign*: Vve commaund *to giue to Cæsar vvhat is dewv to Cæsar*: Vve coniure *euery soul to be Subiect to higher Powvers*, and *that also of necessitie, not only for vvvrath but also for conscience*: breefly vve confess that vvhen the Prince commandeth that vvhich is right & iust, his lavv bynds in conscience, though vvhat he cõmaund, be not otherwise commaunded by Gods lavve. Vve allovv of S. Ignatius his saying: *Cæsari subiecti estote in iis in quibus nullum animæ periculum*, be subiect to Cæsar in those things in which is no danger of soul. Vve tel Kings and Emperours with *Iustinus Martyr*: *nos solum Deum adoramus, & vobis in rebus aliis læti inseruimus*, Vve adore God alone, and in other things vve serue you merily and vvillingly. Vve are taught (as S. Policarp sayed) *to giue to Magistrates and Powvers appomted by God, that honour, vvhich is not preiudicial to our soules or Religion*: Vve vvorship, as Tertulian sayed, the Emperour *Sic, quomodo, & nobis licet, & ipsi expedit, vt hominem à Deo secundum, & solo Deo minorem*, So, and as it is lavvful for vs, and expedient for him, as a man vvho is second to God and only lesser then God. And vvhilest the

Prou. 8. Math. 22. Rom. 13.

Cath. seminds to authoritie.

Ep. ad Antioch.

Orat. ad Anton.

Ex Euseb. l. 4. c. 14.

l. aduers. scap. c. 2.

King keepeth him ſelfe vvithin his bounds, he hath no Superiour in earth: but if he cõmaund any thing againſt Gods lavv: vve muſt obey God before man, and the King before the viceroy. But yet beſide this temporal ſvvord and povver, vve auouch, maugre the *Vvaldens*, *Vviclephiſts*, *Hus*, *Luther*, *Caluin*, that ther is a ſpiritual povver alſo in the Church vvhich byndeth in conſcience. For as ther are in the Church of God tvvo bodyes, the one political and ciuil, the other Eccleſiaſtical or myſtical, the one called the common-vvealth, the other the Church: ſo are ther tvvo povvers to direct and gouern theſe bodyes, and the one is called ciuil or temporal, the other Eccleſiaſtical: and that ruleth the bodyes, this the ſoules, that the Kingdom, this the Church, that makes temporal, this ſpiritual lavves, that decideth ciuil cauſes, this determineth & cõpoſeth controuerſies in Religion, that puniſheth bodyes by the temporal ſvvord, this chaſtiſeth ſoules vvith the ſpiritual glaiues and bonds of excommunication, ſuſpenſion, interdicts, and ſuch like: & the end of that is temporal peace, the ſcope and but of this, æternal fœlicitie, and ſo that being inferiour, this ſuperiour, that muſt yeeld to this, vvhen ther is

Ex Turrecl. 4. ſum. c. 35. vvicl. a. 35. In con. conſtant. ſeſſ. 8. a. 15. ibid. a. 17. in bulla Icon. 10. cal. l. 4. inſt. c. 10. §. 17. in fine.

Tvvo povvers and ſvvords in the Chur.

any oppoſitiõ. For as the body is permitted to conſerue it ſelfe by nurriture and lavvful recreation, and is not to be reſtrained by the ſoule, ſo long as it encrocheth not vppon the ſoules right; but yet if it couet any thing againſt reaſõn, the ſoule is to curb and limit it, ſo as long as the temporal povver raungeth not beyõd her bounds, the Eccleſiaſtical povver muſt permit: but vvhen ſhe encrocheth vppon the Church, then tvvo povvers meeting, reaſon teacheth that in that caſe, that power vvhich offreth vvrong muſt yeeld, and the inferiour muſt obey the ſuperiour. Novv as theſe tvvo povvers are diuers, ſo are they in diuers ſubiects and perſons, and therfore in the lavv of Moyſes, Amatias menaged matters of the Church and lavv, and Zabadias gouerned the affairs pertaining to the office of a King, and Ozias vvas ſtricken vvith a lepreſie in the face for arrogating the Prieſts office, and vvas told by Azarias, that it vvas not his office. And in the nevv lavv Chriſt gaue the charge of gouerning his Church to the Apoſtles only & their ſucceſſors, & that charge he gaue them only, for he committed no Kingdomes to them. And ſo vve giue to the Pope one ſvvord only ouer the Church, and not

A Gen. 1. ad. 2. Par. 19. 2. Par. 26. Mat. 18. Ioh. 21. Epheſ. 4

swords as Sotcliffe sayth. If Sotcliff obiect that he some tymes controlleth Princes, excommunicateth, and deposeth them and disposeth of their crovvns: as Pope Zacharie deposed Childeric, and Leo the third translated the Empire from the Grecians to the Germans, or Fraech; as Gregorie the fifte appointed the 7. Electours, of the Emperour, as Gregorie the seuenth deposed Henrie the fourth, and Innocentius the third deposed, Otho the fourth & Innocentius the fourth Frederic the secõd, and Clemens the sixt Lewis the fourth. Bellarmin and others do answer him, that vvhat he doth in this point he doth not by any tẽporal but only by his spiritual povver, vvhich he hath ouer Princes, & by vvch in necessitie he disposeth of their tẽporal, for the spiritual good of the Church, they being his sheep, he their pastour. And so nether in this doth the Pope vse any temporal power or svvord: and consequently Sotcliffes mouth ran ouer, vvhen he sayd that the Pope handleth swords. But novv vve vvil lay a side svvordes, and come to the Keyes, vvhich Sotcliff saith, the Pope hath no authoritie to vse.

6. Vvhat these Keyes are, Sotcliff should haue explicated, that vve might haue seen

Et Cedreno in vita Leonis Isauri. ex cap. venerabilem extrau. de elect. & Zon. vita Irenæ. ex Blondo dec. 2. l. 3. Naucl. gẽ. 34. platina in vita Greg. 5. ex Magd. cent 11 c. 10. ex Blõdo dec. 2. l. 6. ex cap. ad Apostolicæ de sent. & re iudicia. 6. ex pigh. l. 5. Hier. Eccl. c. 14. 15. Bel. to. 1. l. 5. de Rõ pont. c 5. 6 7.

vvhether that the Pope may iustly make claim vnto them: but because he declares not this point, and peraduentur cannot, I shal not do a miss to teach him vvhat the Keyes of the Church are, before by argument I put them in the Popes handes. Let him knovv then that Keyes are a *Hieroglif* of povver and iurisdiction, and therfore are deliuered to the Prince in his first entraunce into a citie, to signifie that he hath al povver there: and so by the *Keyes* of the Church, is vnderstood a spiritual povver, vvhich the Pastours and especially the suprem Pastour hath, vvhich is called also the *Key* of heauen, bicause it openeth heauen vnto vs, or fast locketh it against vs: And bicause sinne is the only thing vvhich shutteth heauen dores against vs, therfore this povver is called the *Key* of heauen, in that it remitteth sinnes or is ordained to their remission. This povver is of two sortes. The first is the power which a Priest or Bishop receueth in his ordination to consecrate Christs body, to confirme the baptised &c. & this is called *potestas Ordinis*: the second is the povver vvhich they receue out of their Ordination, called Iurisdiction vvhich is giuen them either by the ordinarie vvay, in that they are made Bishops or Pa-

The keyes of the Church.

The key of order.

Of iurisdiction.

stours of such a place, and then it is called *Iurisdictio ordinaria*, or else by special cõmission which is called *Iurisdictio ex commissione*. And this Iurisdictiõ is ether in the invvard court of God and conscience, such as is the povver vvhich Preests haue to absolue in the Sacrament of Confession, vvher the Priest vnder Christ sitteth as Iudge to absolue or condemne, and the pœnitẽt as guiltie, accuseth him selfe and submitteth his cause to be iudged, and then it is called *Iurisdictio in foro interiori*: or else this iurisdiction is giuen to be vsed in the out vvard court of the Church to make lavves, to excommunicate, to suspend, to degrade, to depose, and to absolue from the same and such like paines and censures, and then it is called *potestas iurisdictionis in foro exteriori*: and because al these povvers are ordeined to remission of sinne vvhich shutteth heauẽ dores against vs, therfore they are fitly called the Keyes of the Church, bicause her Pastours haue them, and of heauẽ also, bicause this povver by taking away sinne, like a key openeth heauen dores vnto vs. Yea the iurisdiction of the outvvard court not only in that respect that it is ordeined to remission of sinnes (for that is the end of the Churches lavves and excõmunications

1. Cor. 5.

and

and suspensions) is called a *Key* of heauen: but also in respect of the Church militant which also is called the Kingdom of heauen, and vvhich this external Iurisdiction openeth, in admitting vs to the Church, and shutteth by *excõmunication*, vvhich casteth vs out of the Church and locketh vp her doores against vs. This *power of Keyes*, called *potestas clauium*, is subdiuided into the *Key* of *science*, called *clauis scientiæ*, and the *Key* of *power* called *clauis potentiæ*, vvhich the Pastours of the Church do vse both in the exteriour court of the Church, and in the inner court of God and conscience. For in the sacrament of Pœnance, where the Preest sitteth as Iudge, he taketh knowvledg of the state of his pœnitẽts cõscience, & of all his secret sinnes, & so doth as it were opẽ his hart by this *Key*, and there also he exerciseth the other *Key*, called *clauis potentiæ*, by absolving or bynding the pœnitent, vvhich is greater power the any King yea angel hath. In the exteriour court also the Bishops and Pastours, and especially the suprem Pastour, do vse the *Key* of *science*, vvhen in General, or National, or Prouincial Councels, or otherwise, they decide controuersies of faith and open the Mysteries & difficulties ther-

Mat. 16.

The Key of science.

of power. Io. 20. Chrif. li. 3. de Sacerd.

of: and they exercise the *Key* of power in making lawes and decrees, in dispensing, excommunicating, and absoluing, &c.

The Pope hath these Keyes. Io. 20.

7. *Hauing* thus explicated what is meant by the *Keyes* of the Church, it remains now to proue that the Pope hath commission to vse them. Certes our Sauiour Christ gaue to the Apostles and consequently to S. Peter, power to remit sinnes, Which (as before) is the *Key* of heauen dore: for he sayed to his Apostles: whose sinnes you shal forgiue they are forgiuen them: and seing that the Pope is the lawfull successor to S. Peter (as is proued in the sixt chapter) it followeth that he succedeth to him in this authoritie, and so hath the *Key* of heauen, by which he can open heauen to sinners, by remitting their sinnes, and shut it against them, by denying them absolution. If Luther or Caluin or their Dul-headed Scholer *Sotcliff*, do answer that Christ gaue the Apostles power to remit sinnes, not by any other meanes, then baptism and preaching, their answer shal not suffice, because the power to remitt sinnes by Baptisme, and Preaching was giuen in distinct places from the place alleaged, to wit in the last chapters of Saint Matthewes and S. Markes Ghospels. And

although by Baptisme and Preaching the Priest in some sort remitteth sinnes, yet can he not remit by Baptism th' sinnes cõmitted after Baptisme, bicause Baptism can not be reiterated, and nether by Baptism nor Preaching can he be sayed to *retain sinnes*, and therfore the powver to remit and retain sinnes, vvhich vvas giuen in the tvventith of S. Ihon, must needs be another powver thẽ is the powver to baptise and preach, and no other then that which Priests do exercise in the Sacrament of Pœnaunce, or Confessiõ. Vvherfore S. Ambrose saith that Priests do remit sinnes both in Baptisme, and the Sacrament of Pœnaunce. S. Chrisostome saith that the Priests of Moyses lavv could declare vvhen any was free from the corporal lepric, but the Priests of the nevv lavv do not only declare but truly purge vs, not from the corporal, but from the spiritual lepresie. S. Austen saith it is not sufficient to say, *I do secretly Pœnaunce before God, in my hart,* For then (saith he) *ergo sine causa dictum est quæ solueritis in terra soluta erunt in cælo? ergo sine causa sunt claues datæ Ecclesiæ Dei?* For vvas it sayed vvithout cause, vvhat you loose in earth shalbe looosed in heauẽ were the *Keyes* giuẽ vvithout cause to the Church of God?

Ambr. l. 1. de pœnit. c. 7.

Chrso. l. 3. de Sacerd. & hom. 85. in Io.

to. 10. de 50. hom. ho. 49.

Mat. 18.

And again: *The reconciliation of man and vvife*
L. 2. de Adulter. cõiugij c. 9. *euen after adultries committed and purged, shal neither be dishonourable nor difficile, vvher by the Keyes of the Kingdom of heauen, remission of sinnes is not doubted to be made.* Pacianus answering the heretikes that say: *God only remitteth*
Ep. 2. ad Symp. *sinnes*, cõmeth vppon them thus: *sed & quod per Sacerdotes suos facit, ipsius potestas est*: but
Ibidem. vvhat he doth by his Priests, is his povver: And a litle after he sayth, *that as not only the*
Paulinus in vita Amb. *Apostles do baptise but also their successors: so not only they remitt sinnes, but also their successors.* *Paulinus* saith that S. Ambrose hearing con-
L. de pœn. fessions, vvept as the pœnitents confessed their sinnes, & by his vveping moued them to Contrition. Tertullian telles hovv the Christians in his tyme Kneeled to the Pri-
ep. ad Demoph. ests for remission. *Dionisius Areopagita* S. Paules scholler, reprehended one *Demophilus* for spurning at one, vvho vvas kneeling to the Priest in Confession for absolu-
Ep. ad Heliodor. tion of his sinnes. *S. Hierom* sayth, *God forbid that I should speak ill of Priests, vvho succeeding to the Apostles, by their holy mouth, do make the body of Christ, by vvhom vve also are Christians, who haue the Keyes of the Kingdõ of heauen, do in some sort iudge vs before the day of iudgement.* *S. Victor* vvho vvrote the persequutiõ
Victor l. 2. perseq. Vandal.

of the *Vandals*, and in that represented, the late, yea long, and still during persequution of Ingland, recounteth hovv vvhen the Priests vvere banished by the *Arians*, the Catholike people cryed out most lamentably like bleating sheep to the Priests their Pastors: *To vvhom do you leaue vs miserable, vvhileſt you go to your owvns? Vvho ſhal baptiſe theſe litleones vvith the fontains of the euerlaſting vvater? Vvho ſhal giue vs the guift of Penaunce and free vs from the bandes of ſinnes by the Indulgence of Reconciliation? Becauſe to you it is ſayd, vvhat ſoeuer you ſhal looſe vppon earth ſhal be looſed in heauen.* Mat. 18. Ser. de Petr. & Paul. S. Bernard cõſidering this ſo eminent povver in remitting ſinnes and therby opening heauen, ſaith: *Vvhat is more Potent then Peter vvho hath receaued ſo ſingularly the keyes of heauen, that the ſentẽce of Peter* (to vvit by vvhich he and his ſucceſſors do abſolue vs from our ſinnes) *goeth before the ſentence of heauen?* Vvhich he ſayd, becauſe, although it be one and the ſame ſentence of Abſolution, vvhich Christ pronounceth by the Priest, and vvhich the Priest pronounceth in the name and authoritie of Christ, yet the Priests ſentence which he pronounceth as Christs miniſter, is firſt pronounced in earth and then approued in heauen. And

so the Pope being the Apostles successour hath the *Key* of heauen, which is the power of remitting sinnes in the Inner court of cõscience. That he hath the *key* of iurisdiction in the exteriour court of the Church, is easily proued: bicause he is the high Preest and suprem Pastour, successor to S. Peter, as I proue in the sixt chapter following, but the cheef Pastour must needs haue this Iurisdiction bicause he especially is to gouern and rule the Church by enacting lawes, excommunicating the disobedient, and absoluing the pœnitent, *ergo* the Pope hath this *Key*, this I cõfirm out of scripture, bicause Christ bad S. Peter and in him his Successor, the Pope, *to feed his sheep:* but to a pastours office it pertaineth, not only to cure the inward maladie of these reasonable sheep by remitting their sinnes, but also to gouern thẽ by lawes, to punish them by censures, to seuer the infected by Excõmunication from the rest of the flocke, al which pertaineth to the *Key* of External Iurisdiction. This *key* of Iurisdiction S. Paule vsed, when Excommunicating the Incestuous Corinthian, he deliuered him to the Power of Satan, *For the destructiõ of the flesh, that the spirit may be saued.* So that the power of Excommunicating is

Io. 21.

1. Cor. 5.

a *Key* of heauen bicause, the end of Excommunication is to bring the offender to pœnaunce and amendment, and so to heauen. This Key and povver Christ insinuated when he commanded to correct our brother, & if he be incorrigible to complain to the Church, that is, as S. Chrysostom and the Greek interpretours do expound, to the Pastour or Pastours of the Church, vvhich argueth that they are iudges in this exteriour court, and may Excommunicate the obstinate, that so he may be shunned of Christians, as the Ievves auoyded the cõpany of Ethnikes and publicanes. That the Pope hath the *Key* of *povver* and *Science*, it is manifest, bicause he being Pastour is not only to feed his sheep, but also to loose and bind, to remit sinnes and to retein them, vvhich argueth power and greater povver then Angels haue, and he also is to feed thẽ vvith the word of God and to shew them vvhere to graze. For when he explicates the word of God, he giues them meat, vvhen they vnderstand it, they receue it, vvhen they take delight in it they tast it, and when they profit by it, they are nourished. And he it is that brings the sheep into the feeld by proposing scripture of which euery vvord

Mat. 18. Chryſ. & Græci interpret.

Mat. 18. 10 Chryſ. l. 3. de ſacerd.

is a graſſe or leafe to feed on, and when he expoundeth this ſcripture, he ſhewes them where to graze. So that by expounding ſcriptures and deciding controuerſies in councels and definitions, the Pope vſeth the Key of ſcience, and lawfully alſo, becauſe he is a lawfull Paſtour, who can proue his entraunce into his authoritie and ſeat, by ſucceſſion. To al this *Gregorius Emiſſenus* ſubſcribeth in theſe words: *Tibi dabo claues, Petro principaliter dicitur, cæteris tamen Apoſtolis etiam dictum eſſe intelligi debet, & Epiſcopis & ſacerdotibus: ſtis enim & clauis & poteſtas a Deo data eſt, vt non ſolum Eccleſiam, ſed etiam cælos aperiant: I will giue thee Keyes*, was ſayed principallie to Peter, but yet muſt bee vnderſtood as ſayd alſo to the reſt of the Apoſtles and Biſhops and Prieſts: for to theſe, both the Key and power, was giuen of God, that they may open not only the Church but alſo the heauens. Let Sanderſon now, ſhow as good a warrant for the ſpiritual ſword & Keyes which he and his Miniſters haue vſurped, and we will feare their ſword, and ſeek to get to Heauen by their Key: but in this chapter I haue proued that they are no lawfull Paſtours being not able to proue their vocation, and ſo can vſe no ſpiritual ſword, and I haue al-

Hom. in nat. S. Petri.

ready, and shal more amply anone disproue their ordination and vocation, and so they haue neither the *key* of *order* nor *iurisdiction*. Vvherfore *Sotcliff* may betake him selfe to his old vvhinyard, vvhich he hath of ten worn, but neuer vsed to any good seruice: for to the spiritual sword, he hath no more right then his wife hath. And although he may vvhorthilie cary the key of the butterie dore (which diuers tymes he saith, as though it were certain, that I caryed in my *lord vaux* es house, and that lately also, wheras I neuer bare office in that hovvse, but only (which I shal alwayes gratefully remēber) was admitted by the old lord *vaux* to the domestical Schoole of his Children, and neuer savv ether that or any other Hovvse in Ingland for these Six and twentie yeares) yet, I say, spiritual key *Sotcliff* hath none, bicause he can proue nether his mission nor ordinatiō. only, in that he is a false preacher, he hath the key of *death and Hel* and of the *smoakie pitt of the bottōlesse depth*, mētioned in th'Apocalipse. And vnless he leaue his heresies, which are the gates of hel, and amend his manners, vvhich, I heare, are not so regular, and moderate his speeches, which are nothin but raylings, contumelies, lyes,

Apoc. c. 1. et. 9.

Mat. 16.

and Blasphemies: the key of S. Peter may wel lock him out, but shal neuer giue the fauourable turn to let him in, bicause no such slouens nor vncleane beastes, can be admitted into that so clean Citie and heauenly Hierusalem. But let vs, seing vve haue taken vppon vs, follovv this raunging fellow.

Sotcl. 4. reason.

8. His fourth reason is markable: *Fourthly he is absurd if he claym the right of a Bishop, for he doth not the vvork of a Bishop.* V vhat Sir, think you to carry it a vvay vvith bigg lookes and bold affirmation? not so, you are not yet Pithagoras, and therfore ipse dixit is not sufficiēt. you affirme twoe things; the one that the Pope is no Bishop, the other that he doth not the office of a Bishop, but you proue nether, and so I can as easilie deny as you affirm: especially hauing in the sixt chapter proued the Pope to be S. Peters true successour and consequently a true Bishop as he was. As for your reason it is already answered: and I hope by that vvhich I haue sayed to your second reason, you haue learned, that not to do the vvork of a Bishop, is no argument to proue the Pope noe Bishop. Yet if you thought it a good argumēt, vvhy did you not shevv, how he doth not

The answer.

the vvork of a Bishop? Certes the vvorke of a Priest & Bishop, if vve beeleue S. Paule *is to offer giftes and Sacrifices For sinnes*: & this the Pope doth, and no minister nor superintendet doth, or can do, and so he is a preest and Bishop, they noe. But I Knovv on vvhat string he harpeth: he vvill say the Pope preacheth not, and so doth not al the vvorkes of a Bishop: yet this also maketh litle for him. For if it bee a good argument: the Pope doth not al the offices of a Bishop, *ergo* he is no Bishop: then this argument also must go current; The King doth not al the workes of a suprem head of the Church, bicause he nether preacheth nor ministreth Sacramẽts (which yet pertaineth vnto him if he bee suprem head and Pastour in causes Ecclesiastical, bicause the suprem Pastour cã do al the, inferiour Pastour can do, though the inferiour can not do al that he can do) *ergo* he is no suprem head; and so *Sorcliff* falleth into a Præmunire. If he answer that the King preacheth and ministreth Sacraments by others, the same vvil I answere for the Pope, & I vvil add, that in tymes past, when Popes vvere not so laden vvith yeares and affayres as novv, they preached and ministred Sacraments in their ovvn person, and

Heb. 5.

The Pope doth the vvorkes of a Bishop.

stil sometymes do, (which Kings neuer did) and are ready alwayes to doe the same offices when ther is any necessitie. In the meane tyme he offereth sacrifice, ordaineth or constituteth Bishops, enacteth Ecclesiastical lawes, calleth councels, dispenseth, excommunicateth, and absolueth, and whatsoeuer he doth not by him selfe immediatly, he giueth commission to others to doe: and so doth the work of a Bishop.

Sot. 5. reason.

9. His last argument is this: *Lastly the Apostles successours, and Preachers sent from God proceed according to their commissiō and instructions receiued from God*, but the Pope *proceedeth according to his owne Decretals and the rules of his owne Chancerie: out then must he goe.* But first,

The like argument folk vseth in D. Bristowes reply p. 1. c. 7. pag 92.

out with the foole, he marres the play: for if it be sufficiēt to disproue the Popes mission, to say that he *Proceeds not according to his instructions receiued from God*, to wit in scripture, al the old heretikes mouthes so long since stopped are opened against al the auncient Popes S. Gregorie and vpward; for those heretikes alleaged scripture & sayd that the Church and Pope proceeded not according to Scripture: Yea if this be sufficient to disproue the Popes Mission, it is sufficient (as at least it seems Sot. would haue it) to proue

The answer.

any Preachers Mission, and so the gap is opened to al heretikes, vvho, as vve shal see in the next chapter, haue euer alleaged scripturs for their doctrine, and so proued them selues lavvfully sent, bicause *they proceeded according to their commission and instructions receiued from God, in Gods vvord.* And if *Sotc:* reply, that they proceeded not in deed according to Gods vvord in the true sense, but only in their own meaning, the same would they say of him & his, and so another propose more proper, must be found out to prooue the preachers mission, vvhich is lavvfull succession. Certes in this argument *Sotel.* Puttes the Carte before the horse, & vseth the figure *ὑστερον πρότερον.* For *Sotel.* must be sent, and must proue his Mission also, before he preach (as I haue proued in this chapter at large) and yet he wil preach before he proue his Mission, becausc he vvil alleage and interpret scriptur (vvhich is to preach) therby to proue that *he proceedeth according to his instructions receiued in Gods vvord:* and so preaching to proue his missiō, preacheth before he proues his Mission. But vvere it, that *Sot.* could proue that he and his do preach nothing contrarie to Scriptur, yet vvould not that make him a lavvfull preacher. For as one

A similitud.

that is no Ambassadour, stealing the letters of credit which the King had prouided for the true Ambassadour, may proceed according to the directions and instructions conteined in the letters; so although *Sotcliff* did proceed according to the instructions giuen in Gods word to the true preachers, yet vnless he be sent, he is a theef that hath stolne the Princes letters (as I proue in the next chapter that al these new preachers are) and an impostour, no Ambassadour. Yea *Sotcl.* vvise may preach according to scriptur, and yet shal she be noe lavvful Ministress because she is not sent nor called. But *Sotcliff* vvil say that at least this is a good argument *à posteriori*. The Pope proceedeth not according to the word of God, *ergo* he is no Lavvfull preacher: I graunt his consequence, but I deny his Antecedent, & a vvyser man then *Sotcliff* shal neuer be able to proue it. And thus much to this last argument. Novv of vvee vvill followv *Sotc.* Vvee must leap, because he leapes from the Pope to Cardinals, Monkes and Friars, but as the Flovvnder doth out of the Frying pan into the Fier, or as the French man saith: *il saulte du coq à l'asne.*

9. *The Cardinals* (saith he) *are of late standing:*

S. Peter had no Cardinals about him: nor vvere the Parish Priests of Rome that assisted the ancient Bishops of that Citie so Gallaunt fellovvves: they nether Preach nor Baptise as Cardinals and therfor can not pretend right of succession from the Apostles as from ancient Bishops or Priests. This leap, as it seemeth, hath disturbed his braines. For see hovv like a brainles or brainsick fellow he fights against him self? he graunteth that Cardinals nether baptize nor preach as Cardinals, and yet bicause they are of late standing he disproueth their mission. O the Sotet. If they preach not as Cardinals, then as Cardinals they need no missiō, if they need noe Mission, they need not to shew any succession from the Apostles, to proue their Mission. Vvhy then doth our Dean go about to disproue the Popes and Bishops mission, bicause Cardinals are not sent by Succession: vvho as Cardinals are nether Bishops nor Priests, nether preach nor baptize, and so do need no mission? Now, if Cardinals can not be descēded from the Apostles and ancient Bishops, *bicause the Parish Preests of Rome that assisted the ancient Bishops of that Citie vvere not so Gallaunt fellovvves*: Then by the same reason, *Sotel.* and his Superintendents must be packing: bicause nether the Parish Preests,

Cardinals defended.

Ex ca. 17. Apost. ex conc. Nic. ca. 3. Cóc. Carthag. 2. ca. 2. Cóc. Rom. sub Siluest. ca. 2. Leo 1. epist. 82. Gre. ep. 42 Epiphā. in fine operis cont. haer. Hiero. li. cont Vigilantium.

no nor the Popes of Rome, nor the Bishops of other Cities, before Constantine, were so Gallaunt fellowes as now his Superintendents are. For they were neuer so fatt in Benefices, not so statelie in houses and retinew, much leis so combted with vines and beardes as *Sotcl.* Ministers and Superintendents are: who neuer maryed after holy orders, nor vsed their wiues maryed before orders, till the Greekes began that custome. But our *Sotcliff* had not wit to distinguish three things in Cardinals; the first is the authoritie of Priests and Bishops which many of them haue: the second is the office of Counsellers & Electors, for they chuse the Pope and assist him being chosen: the third is their splendour, which consisteth in Purple robes, cappes and hattes, together with their precedence before all Bishops and Patriarchs, graunted vnto them by reason that they are Electours and Counsellers & next to the Pope in the external gouernment of the Church. In the first two respects, Cardinals do succeed the ancient Bishops and Priests, bicause the immediat Successors of the Apostles were Pastours and Bishops & Counsellers to the Pope, at least in Councells: But in respect of the third I graunt

Vide Bellarm. to. 1. l. 1 de cler. c. 16.

they

they are not of such standing: For although the name of Cardinal Deacons, & Cardinal Priests, be very ancient, yet the splēdour & præmineēce was much later. But our Grashopper, is still leaping, from Cardinals he proceedeth to Monks and Friars. Ex Cone. Rom. sub Silu. Greg L11. cp. 34. Lep. 9. cp. ad Mich. Imper.

19. *The monkes and Friars*, saith *Sotel. are no vvhere mentioned in Scriptur &c. They succeed not Pastours and teachers, for their profession is powertie, chastitie and obedience*, as though these vertues vvere not fit for pastors, to vvit Ministers. *Their authoritie is vvholly from the Pope, and other commission can they shevv none.*

To this I answver as to his former obiection against Cardinals: For vve may consider Monkes and Friars & Religious men, ether as they are Preests, Bishops and Pastours (as many of them are) and so they proue their Mission and ordination as other Priests and Pastours do, to vvit by succession from the Apostles, and impositiō of hands of Lavvfull Bishops: or if they bee the first Pastours in any place, they are sent by the Pope, vvho is descended from the Apostles. And thus S. *Austen* our first Arch-bishop of *Canterburie* deriued his Mission from the Apostles, bicause he vvas sent by Saint *Gregorie*, vvho succeeded the Apostles, although in regard Monks defended.

of the infidels to vvhom he preached, and to vvhom his ordinarie Mission vvas vnknovvn, miracles vvere also necessarie, and vvere not vvanting. And by this manner of succession, the *Arch-Priest* and Priests in Ingland, and the *Iesuits* in Ingland and the *Indies*, do proue their mission: or else vvee may consider Religious men as they are Religious, and so vve confesse that they can not detiue their Missiō from the Apostles, nether need they, bicause as Religious, they are not sent to Preach, yea vve confesse that in this respect, they are no ancienter then their founders. For although the vowes of pouertie, and obedience, and chastitie, be so ancient, that the fathers and diuines affirme this life to haue proceeded from the Apostles, and to haue been practised euen in their tyme, and much more after, as *Dionisius Areopagita*, *Athanasius*, *S. Austen*, *S. Basil*, *S. Epiphanius*, *S. Hierom*, *S. Chrisostom*, *Cassianus*, *S. Bernard*, *Eusebius*, *Sozomen*, *S. Bede*, *S. Thomas of Aquin*, *Thomas Valdensis*, and many others do affirme: yet the professiō of a certain religious life vnder a certain rule and Superiour confirmed by the Pope, is not so ancient, & is no ancienter then the Founders, and so in this respect is not deriued from the

Dion. l. 3. c. Hier. c. 10. Athan. ep. 9. Aug. l. 17. ci. c. 4. Basil. serm. Ascet. de Renunc. & in constit. mon. c. 19. & 17. Epp. her. 29. 58. Hiero. in Marco & Phil. Chr. hom. 17. in Mat. & ho 17. ad pop. Anti. cōst. vtupe vit. mon. Cass. col. 18 c. 5.

Apostles, as nether is it needfull it should, bicause religious, as religious, are not sent to Preach, vnlesse it be conteined specially in their rule, & so need not to proue their mission from the Apostles by succession. But now our *Sot.* not wel here, leapes back again to Preests, and so vve must follow him.

11. *Masse preests (saith he) are not sent to Preach and Minister sacraments, but to sacrifice Christs body and bloud vnder the accidents of bread and vvine for quick and dead, but such a mission is nowhere found in Scripture.* See the vvit of this man. He saith Mass-preists are not sent to preach and minister Sacraments, but only to Sacrifice, which is an vsual escape of his tongue called a lye. then he saith that a mission to Sacrifice, can not be proued out of Scriptur, and so he vvould haue the Preachers mission to be proued out of Scriptur, which is a folly, and a fault also, for vvhich I haue already taken him vp sharply. But hovv it vvil be a Sport to see hovv he proueth that the Mass-preists mission to Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, is not be proued out of Scriptur. *For our Sauiour* (saith he, and as he thinks vvisely) *instituting the Sacrament of the Eucharist, sayd take, eate, drinke, and now Sacrificate pro vnis & defunctis, Sacrificeper for quick*

& li. 2. de Institit. c. 5. Ber. ep. ad Fratres de mõte Dei. & Apol. ad Gul. Eus l. 2. Hist. c. 16 18. l. prep. Euag. c. 4. & ep. ad marin. Soz l. 1 hist c. 12. Bed. Præf. in Mar. Tho. Aquin. 2 2 q. 88. ar. 4. Th. Vvald. tom. 1 tit 3. c. 3. n. 4. 5.

Priests mission to Sacrificeloo kby by Sot. impugned.

Mat. 26.

and dead, true it is that he saith, hoc facite, do this. but hoc facere, doth no vvhere, ether in scriptur or prophane Authours signifie sacrifice this. Virgil is alleaged vvher one saith, cum faciam vitula, but if they bring no better prooses, the Maß-priests vvil proue them selues as vvise as calues: for it is one thing to say facere vitula, and facere hoc. I set down his vvords, bicause I vvould not hide his vvit. For he hath here playd the calfe so naturally, that if he had liued vndet the lavv of the Iewes, he had been in danger to haue been sacrificed, for such a beast. *Christ* (saith he) *sayd take, eate, drink, but sayd not sacrifice for the quick and dead.* He sayed Good man calfe (for that now is your name) that which implied as much, vvhich is sufficient. For he sayed at his last supper: *Take, eate, this is my body vvhich is giuen for you*: bicause the Greek *διδόμενον* importeth the præsent tence. He sayd also *take this is my blood*: to vvhich vvordes S. Luke addeth, *vvhich is shed for you.* For the Greek *ἐκχυνόμενον*, importing also the præsent tence, signifieth the blood to bee thē shed and powred out for them, not out of the vain, but out of the chalice vnder the accidents of vvine. And seing that, nether bread nor vvine, nor the figure of Christs body, could bee sayd to bee *giuen for them*,

The same proued.

Matt. 26.

Mar. 14.

Luc. 22.

though they might be sayed, to be giuen to them, it followeth that his true body and bloud vvas then *giuen* and offred for them by Christ to his Father, and consequently that then he offred a sacrifice of his body and bloud. By this and other arguments, I proue in my fourth booke and second chapter, as also in other places, that in the *Masse* is offered a true sacrifice. And for as much as Christe after him selfe had offred this sacrifice, cõmaunded his Apostles, and in them, their Successors to do the like, saying: *Hoc facite, do you this*, it followveth also that *Hoc facite, do you this*, signifieth *sacrificate* sacrifice you this. As for example, if *Sotteliff* should drink a Santé or health vnto his *General*, and then say to his fellovv souldiers, *Hoc facite* do you this: thẽ *Hoc facite* do you this, must signifie, drinke you a health, as I haue done. Vvherfore although *Hoc facite* do you this, did neuer other vvise signifie *Hoc sacrificate*, sacrifice you this; yet Christ hauing him selfe sacrificed (as I haue proued he did) and then immediatly bidding his Apostles to do the same, it followveth that *Hoc facite* doe this, must needs in this place import as much as *Hoc sacrificate* sacrifice you this. But besides that in this place, *Hoc facite* do this, can

import no other thing, it doth often tymes signifie to sacrifice and so much more in this place. And so *Sotcliffe*, that saith *facere, neither in scripture nor prophane Authours* doth signifie to sacrifice, is ether impudent or ignorant, let him take which he will. For first him selfe citeth Virgils verse: *Cum faciam vitula*, (or *viridam*, as *Nonnius* saith an old manuscript hath) *pro fruibus ipse venito*. Which *Seruius* expoundeth *cum faciam thus, cum sacrificauero* when I shal sacrifice. So do *Germanus Valens*, and *Budeus* expound it, who citeth also *Plautus, Virgil*, and *Iuuenal* to shew that *facere* doth many tymes signifie to sacrifice. And if *Sotcl.* hath read *Plautus* the *Comedian*, (whose profession for him had been more sutable then his Ministerie) he may remember that he useth *facere* for *sacrificare*, as in his *Aululatia*, where he shal read these words: *Nunc lauabo vt rem diuinam faciam: &* again: *Mulsi congialem plenam faciam tibi fidelium*. So that in prophane Autours *facere* is sometymes found to signifie *sacrificare*: and *mentiri* is oftner found in *Sotcliffes* mouth, then *verum dicere*. In Scripture also *facere* is taken for *sacrificare*: of which, *Sotcliff* should not haue been ignorant, being a Scripturian. As in Exod: *facere phase Domino*: and in

Eclog 3. Palæmon. Nonnius.

Seruius. German' Valens. Budeus.

Plautus in Aulol. act. 4.

Exod 12.

Leuiticus: *facietis & hircum pro peccato*, you shal sacrifice a goat for sinne. Leuit.23. And in the third of the Kinges: *Helias* saith, *Ego faciam bouem alterum.* In the book of *Numbers*, *Faciet que Sacerdos vnum pro peccato.* 1.Reg. c 18. Num.6. In diuers other places also this word *facio* is taken for *sacrifico*. S. Ambrose subscribeth saying, *I offer the Sacrifice vvhich thou instituted st and commaundedst*, to vvit vvhen he sayd *hoc facite*. 1 prep.ad Missam. S. *Clement* saith, *Facite sacrificium*, &c. *offer the sacrifice of vvhich you are acertained vvhen it vvas sayd Hoc facite.* l. 5 const. c.8. S. *Chrisostom* auoucheth that *Christ* sayd *hoc facite to vvithdrawe vs from the old sacrifice, and for the sacrifice of brute beasts he commaunded him selfe to be offred.* Ho. 24.in 1. Cor. & ho. 83.in Mat. S. *Ihon Damascen* auerreth that Christ sayd *Hoc facite, do you this in my commemoration, and by his omnipotēt precept, this is effectuated till he come.* l.4 c.14. And according to this the *Councel of Trent* defineth that Christ by those vvords, made his Apostles Priests and commaũded them and in them their Successors, to offer this sacrifice. Sess.22.c.1 By this vve see that *Sotc.* is neither humanist nor Scripturist, to deny that *facere* is taken for *sacrificare*, and he that calles the Mass-priests, and consequently the fathers calues, for proving the sacrifice of the Masse out of the words *hoc facite*, deserues him sel-

se to be sacrificed for a calfe, vnless he plead by the old law, to be redeemed for an asse.

12 But *Sotcliff* sayth that at least Christ *had not his Apostles to sacrifice for the quick and the dead.* Yes sir Dean, he commaunded that also: for he then offered a sacrifice for the quicke and Dead, and commaunding the Apostles to do the same, in them, he commaunded the Masse-priests their Successors, to offer this sacrifice for the quicke & dead. That he offred then for the quick and dead I proue thus: bicause S. *Matthew* and saint *Mark* affirm that he offred for many, S. *Luke* sayth he offred *for you* the Apostles: and the Church in the vvords of consecration puteth in both, saying *for you and many.* Novv some by many, vnderstand the elect as Paludanus and Richard *Middleton* in 4. d. 8. others by *many* vnderstand *al*: as doth saint Chrisostom and Theophilact vppon these vvords. S. Thomas of Aquin 3. p. q. 38. ar. 3. thus expoundeth those vvords: *vvhich for you*, that is the Apostles and their Successors, is offered, and *for many*, that is the laytie: or thus, *vvhich is offered for you* the Ievves, and *for many* that is the gentils. So that Christ offered this sacrifice for al at least *quoad sufficientiam* though only for the

elect *quoad efficacium*, and seing that ther is no reason vvhy the dead, vvho are in purgatorie, should be excluded, they being capable both of prayer and sacrifice (as appeareth by the sacrifice of Iudas Machabeus offered for the dead 2. *Mac.* 12) I say that Christ offered for the dead: and seing that he commaunded the Apostles, and in them, the Mass-Priests, to do as he had done, it followeth that he commaunded them to offer for the quick and the dead. And according to this in al the ancient Liturgies, and in particuler that of S. Iames vvhich the sixt Synod approueth as his, *Sore*: shal find that this Sacrifice from the beginning hath been offered for the dead, vvhich custome *Tertullian* mentioneth in these vvords: *Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitijs annua die facimus*, vve make oblations for the dead &c. S. *Cyprian* also, *Eusebius*, *Nicephorus* and *Platina* relate the selfe same custome. And S. *Auste* boldly affirmeth; *that is it not to bee doubted, but that by the prayers of the holy Church, the healthfull sacrifice, and almes vvhich are giuen for the Spirits of the dead, the dead are holpen.* And thus much for proofe of the Mass-Priests Mission to offer sacrifice for the quick and the dead.

l. de coro. mil. c. 3. Cip. l. 1 ep. 4. Eus. l. 4. de vit. Cõstan. c. 71. Nic. l. 8. c. 16. Plat. in vit. Sixti. Aug. ser. 34 de ver. Apost.

Then *Sotcliff* concludeth vvith a long pag. 4.

ergo in this manner. *If then they be false Prophets, Theeues and Robbers* (as I cal him and his ministers bicause they can not proue their mission, *that come without Mission or sufficient warrant, then are the Popes of Rome, Cardinals, Monkes, Friars, and Mass-priests, false Prophets.* But I hauing answered to al that he can obiect against Popes Cardinals monkes Friars and Mass-priests Mission: this conclusion serues only for a pursuer to catch the foole in.

*Sotcliffes arguments and answer for his own preachers mission refuted.*

1. HOw weak our aduersarie hath been in impugning Catholique Priests Mission wee haue seen: now it remayneth vve examin his force in defending the mission of his own Ministers; to see whether this Souldier haue more dexteritie in resisting then assailing, and in warding then giuing a blow.

First saith he, *It can not be denyed but our Bishops were lawfully ordained by imposition of hands of other lawfull Bishops.* Behold how wisely he beginneth. The question was about his Ministers mission, he answereth for their ordination. And what saith he

for that he saith *it can not bee denyed*. Marke his boldnes. Al Catholikes do deny it, and I haue denied and disproued it in this chapter and in the fourth booke also and first chapter of my Survey, and yet he saith *it can not be denyed*. But if *it can not be denyed*, it may easilie be proued, and so, *it can not be denyed*, but that *Sot* is an euil Aduocat, that can not defend that cause, *vvhich can not be denyed*. Go on thē M. Attorney, let vs hear you plead. *The ordination of Bishop Cranmer and other Bishops then liuing, the Papists them selues can not deny to be lavvfull, but from them other Bishops following receiued the rite of consecration.* He affirmeth tvvo things: the first that *Cranmer* and other Bishops then liuing when he was consecrated, vvere truly ordeined. The second that from them, other Bishops following receiued their consecration. And as for the first I deny not, but that *Cranmer* was truly ordeined, because Catholike Bishops consecrated him, and I confesse also that his hæresie could not deface his consecration and *caracter*, that being indelible and vndefaceable. And so I confesse that he liued and dyed true Bishop, but peraduentur he vvas neuer true and lavvful *Arch-bishop* of *Canterburie*. Because King Henrie the eight,

Th. 3. p. q. 63 ar. 5. Aug. l. 1. de bap. cont. Donat. c. l. 2. con. Par. c. 13.

gaue him his Bishoprick vppon condition, that he should pronounce sentence for his newe desired mariage, and so he committed simonie in accepting his Benefice vvith an obligation, which is *pretio æstimabilis* temporally prizeable: and vvith this intention of obeying the King against the Pope, he swoare obedience to the Pope: and so got his Bishopricke by simonie, periurie, and cousenage. So that though he vvere true Bishop, yet vvas he no true Arch-bishop nor lavvfull succeſſour to his predeceſſour Bishop *Vvaram*: and being no lavvful Arch-bishop, though he might haue ordeined others, if he had vsed the matter and forme, (bicause ordination is an act of the order & *caracter* vvhich is indelible) yet could he exercise no act of Iurisdiction, he hauing none him selfe, bicause he had no right title to the Arch-bishopricke as vve haue seen. But suppose he had come rightly to his Benefice and so had been also true Arch-bishop and lavvful Succeſſor to Bishop *Vvaram*: Yet vvhen he began to preach hæresie in King Edvvards tyme, (though therby he lost not his consecration and order) he had no commission nor calling to such an office and Ministerie, for, from vvhom should he haue

Sand. I de schism. pa. 57. 58.

it? Not from the Pope, for he gaue him only commission to preach the Catholique Romain faith. Not from Bishop *Vvarham* his prædecessour or other our Bishops, for he vvas a most Catholike Bishop, and they nether vvould nether could haue autorized hæretical preaching, yea they exclaimed against him. Not from any heretical Bishop of his ovvn Religion, for he vvas the first heretical Arch-bishop; al, euen from S. Austen the first, being most Catholique Prælates as the *Catalogue* to this day and the very Church of *Canterburie* vvill vvitnesse. So that *Cranmer* preached this nevv doctrine before he was sent, and so preaching him selfe without commission, could giue none to any other: and seing that all the Ecclesiastical Iurisdiction of the nevv Church of England proceedeth from him (for nether doth *Sotc:* nether can he, or any other, detiue it any higher) no Bishop or minister in Inglād hath lavvfull calling or commission to preach.

The same argumēt I make against other Bishops and Ministers of this new Church. Vvheras *Sot:* saith that *Bishop Parker vvas cōsecrated by imposition of hands of Bishop Barloe,* pag. 5. *Bishop Couerdale, Bishop Scory, and vvvoe suffragans mentioned in the Act of Consecration yet*

to be seen: I say, bee it that al these were true
I. deschism pag. 165. Bishops and lawfully ordeined, yet in King Edvvards tyme, nether matter nor forme of ordination, vvas vsed, and so none vvere truly ordeined, much lesse had they commission to preach heresie, and so could not send others to preach. Vvhence followeth that all the *Superintendents* and *Ministers* are vvithout calling, and votation, and consequently that *Sotcliff* must yeeld vp his deanrie bicause *Beneficium datur propter officium.*
I. deschism pag. 166. The autour of the booke of the Schism of Ingland, telles hovve vvhen your nevv superintendents vvere to be created, they finding none to consecrate them, vvere fain to make their sute to a Bishop of Ireland to assist at their cōsecration, who refusing, they made one another Bishops: &as I have hard credibly reported, some of the vvere made Bishops at the Nagges head (a fit Church for such a consecration) vvith no other ceremonies then laying the English Bible on their heads: and bicause this consecration vvas not counted lavvful, they vvere enforced to get it authorized in the next Parlament, though they had playd the Bishops before. And so if the Parlament, in vvhich the Temporal Prince commaundeth, can

not rightly ordain Bishops: they and their
successors are no Bishops, and haue neither
order nor Iurisdictiō. And for as much as ye
inferiour Ministers are made by these, and
are children of these Fathers, they also are
noe true preests, having neither true order
nor Iurisdiction.

3. But I meruail that in al these straites to
vvhich *Sot.* is driuen, he runneth not to the
Princes authoritie and supremacie for assi-
staunce, vvarranting his Bishops and mini-
sters bicause they are authorised by King
Edward, or *Queen Elizabeth*, vvho estably-
shed their first clergie. Beike he was affrayd
to offend *Calvin*, or he thought that this Caln. ia c.
being an Ecclesiastical office to ordain & in- 7. Amos.
uest and install ministers, did not appertain
to the Prince: and so denying the supema-
cie he falleth into a *præmunire*. Certes in the
Parlament holden the first yeare of the
Reign of *Elizabeth* it vvas decreed by the Sand. l. de
sayd parlamēt that *Queene Elizabeth* should schism. fol
haue al power for reformatiō and correctiō 149. 150.
of the clergie, for the Iudgment, and puni- 151.
shement of schismes and heresies, and for
al nominations to Bishoprickes. There
also vvas decreed, that no *Synod* should be
called, nor any thing in any *Synod* decreed,

vvithout expres consent and licence of the Prince: and that Bishops should be created by no mans nomination, election or authoritie, then the Princes. And according to this shee gaue by her letters, authoritie to the Arch-bishop to promote in his Diocese, vnto orders: and the Arch-bishop when he wrote to his clergie vsed this stile: *Vus N. by the diuine permission, Arch-bishop and primat of Ingland, by the Queenes Maestie sufficiently and lawfully authorised* &c. So that according to this Parlament, al authoritie Ecclesiastical in Inglād, is deriued from King Edward and *Queen Elizabeth*, and cōsequently if they could not make true Bishops and Ministers (as Caluin and the puritanes in England Scotlād, Fraunce, *Geneua*, Flāders, hold they cā not) there is no true ordinatiō nor vocation in Inglād, and so no true clergie. for this cause the puritanes (as vve gather by their admonition to the Parlament, and read in the booke of dangerous positions) auouch boldly that the Ecclesiastical gouernmēt in Inglād is *Antichristian, deuilsh, litle better then that of the Samaritanes, traiterous against the Maiestie of Iesus Christ, a false, vnlavvfull, and bastardly gouernment.* And the same admonition saith that *your Ministers ar not according*

Admonit. Parl. l. 2. c. 4.

to

to Gods vvord elected, called, or ordained.

4. Then Sotcliff thinking that he hath proued the ordination and calling of the ministers in England very sufficiently, seekes to make good the ordination of the Ministers in other countries. *Our brethren* (saith he) *in Germany and Switzerland had imposition of Hands from Luther, Zuinglius, Occolampadius and Bucer: in Fraunce from Farel, in Scotland from Knox and others, vvhom the papists can not deny to haue been lavvfully ordeined Priests.* See how high he fetcheth the pedegree of his Pastours: from *Cranmer* in England, from *Luther, Zuinglius and Occolampadius* in Germanie and Suizzerland, from *Farel* in Fraunce, and frō *Knox* in Scotland. And yet al these were of diuers religions, and preached and vvrote one against another, condēning eche other as damnable heretikes, as we shal see in the next booke. But before these, vvhat preachers, pastours or Bishops, of your order can you name? if none, then before Luther in Germanie *Farel* in Fraunce, *Cranmer* in England, *Knox* in Scotland, there vvas no true Church (if your Church be the true) bicause the Church and Pastours euer vvent together. If there vvere any, let *Sot:* name them, but bicause he can name none of his

own pastours, vvho should ordain and send thē he . annesto our Bishops, but in vayn, as I haue declared against *Cranmer*. To vvhich I add this *Dilemma*. ether our Bishops were lavvful, or vnlavvfull? If lavvfull, then your Bishops and Ministers are vnlavvfull, bicause they excluded the true Pastours and intruded them selues into their Roomes, & preached against their commandement. If they vvere vnlavvfull (as Caluin saith that our ordinatiō is a meare mockerie, and our Bishops no Bishops) then is our deane a *Sot*, to deriue the ordinatiō of his ministers from our Bishops: bicause they could not giue his ministers vvhat thē selues had not, and his ministers can not be lavvful successors, if they vver vnlavvful predecessors. But *Sotcliff* fearing, and iustly, that nothing of this vvhich he hath sayd for his Bishops and Ministers ordination and mission vvil suffice, he endeuoureth to proue that noe ordination nor mission vvas necessarie.

L. 4. inst. c. 5. § 3. & c. 10. § 6.

pag. 5. §. *Nether is it materiall* (saith *Sot.*) *that the first preachers of the Ghospel in these countries vvere not Bishops, and so called as it vvas in England. For suppose no Bishops would haue renounced the heresies of Popes, should not inferiour Ministers teach truth and ordain other teachers after them?*

*Furthermore they vvanted nothing of true Bishops but the name and title* &c. Here vve see how fayn *Sorchff* would haue it that no mission or ordinatiō should be necessarie, that so fayling in proof of his ovvn, it may not seem so material. And bicause he savv that *Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Farel, Calvin, Knox*, vvere no Bishops, he saith that inferiour ministers, vvhen Bishops vvil not renounce the Pope, may ordein others. And yet it vvas euer the office of a Bishop only, to ordein. So Paule and Barnabas Bishops ordeined preests in euerie Church by imposition of handes, which rite is vsed in diuers other places of scripture, by the apostles only and Bishops, and neuer by inferiour ministers. According to this the Apostles in their first canon, and the first counsel of Nice in the fourth canon, and the second counsel of carthage in the tvvelfe canon, haue decreed that a Bishop should be ordeined by three Bishops. And S. Hierom in his epistle to *Eustyrius* though he labour to shevv some æqualitie betwixt Preests and Bishops, yet he graunteth that a Bishop in ordination is greater. Vvhereas *Sorchff* saith that *Luther, Zuinglius, Farel, Calvin*, and the rest vvanted nothing of Bishops but the title,

Act. 6. 13. & 1. Tim. 4. 5. 2. Tim. 1.

can. Apo. can. 1. cōc. Nic. c. 4. cōc. carth. 2. can. 12.

Ep. 8.

he saith that, belike, to make him selfe a Bishop, for if they without ordination were Bishops, and only wanted the name and Title, then are he & his wife Bishops. Now Sot: addeth, that *in a defection of Bishops of a nation, ministers may be lawfully ordeined by other Ministers, because the presbiterie hath right to impose hands, and the Keyes are called the Keyes of the Church not of Bishops, and for that necessitie admitteth not the observance of all ceremonies.* But it is necessitie that driues Sotc: to these answers: for both scripture and the preachise euen of the priuatiue Church dot testifie, that Bishops only and not the presbyterie are to ordein, as is declared, & in a defectiō, nationall, Bishops must be consecrated by other Bishops of other nations and sent by the Cheefe Pastours authoritie. So *Pope Gregorie* the first sent S. *Austen* to England in a defection of Bishops. Yet be it (which yet is false) that *Luther* no Bishop, and *Farel* no Bishop might ordeyn others, yet who sent *Luther* and *Farel* to preach their new doctrine? Not their owen preachers, because they thē selues were the first, not our preachers, because they exclaimed against them they ranne then vnsent and preached before they were called to the ministerie, and so

Pag. 3.

hauing no commission them selues, they could giue none to others.

6 Then *Sotcliff* finding no sure aboad in this starting hole, runneth to another, and vvould authorise his mission by the people. *Lastly* (saith he) *for that necessitie admitteth not the obseruaunce of al Ceremonies. As for example admit a multitud of Christians should go into the Indies vvithout ministers; it is not to be supposed, but they haue povver to appoint Ministers among them selues in this case of necessitie.* But nether in this starting hole, can this vvearied Fox hide him selfe, but that by the sent of a stinking false preacher, vve shal find him out. Is this then your last refuge? *& cum nemini obtrudi potest iturne ad populum?* Vvhen you can father your mission on none, must you authorize it by the peoples Certes now wee see that *necessitas cogit ad turpia.* For I haue already proued that none can ordein ministers vnlesse they be Bishops: and *Caluin*, (vvhom *Sotcliff*, coming from his Church of *Geneua*, should haue reuerenced) standeth in this point Stoffely against him, saying: *Hoc postremo habendum est, non vniuersam multitudinem munus imposuisse suis Ministris, sed solos Pastores.* 4. Inst. c. 3 § 16. *Thus Lastly is to be holden, that not the vvholle multitud, but the Pastors only, did impose*

hands vppon their Ministers. And doth not Sotcliffe see, how vvabsurd it is that the sheep should ordain their pastours, vvho can not distinguish betvvixt vvolues and Pastours, bicause they can not discern true from false doctrin? Or doth he not knovv, that the multitud is *a beast of many heads*, tumultuous and mutinous, which vvould make elections and ordinations, to end in blovvs and bickerings? And is not this to confound the Church and the common vvealth, Magistrats and Ministers, Princes and Prælates, and to put no more sanctitie in Ministers ordination, then in the Creation of *Mayours*, *Aldermen*, and *Cryers* of the Market? Vvhatsoeuer the people in tymes past hath done in giuing testimonie or suffrage in the election of Ministers, Sotcliffe may read in Bellarmine, but neuer shal he finde in Ecclesiastical histories, that the people ordeyned Bishops or priests. To be breife (as it is hard to be vvith this raunging fellow) if the people vvere to ordein or to giue iurisdiction to preach, it should followv that preachers could neuer preach to heretikes and infidelles, though Christ commaunded his Apostles and their successors to preach to all: and this I proue thus. None must preach vnlesse

to. 2. l. 1. de eccl. c. 7.

Mat. & Marc. vlt.

they be ſent (as S. Paule aſſureth, and as I haue proued at large in this chapter to vvch Sot: endeuoureth to anſvver) but the heretical or pagane people vvil neuer giue leaue and licence to a Catholike preacher, *ergo*, if from the people he expect his commiſſion, he ſhal neuer be able to preach. Ro. 10.

7. *Vvheras* Sot: ſaith, *that the Keyes are called the Keyes of the Church and that therfore in a defection of ordinarie Paſtours the people may ordain miniſters*: I anſvver that the *Keyes* of the Church being a ſpiritual povver, as aboue I haue declared, are only in the Paſtours hãds: for Chriſt vvhen he promiſed & gaue theſe Keyes, he ſpake only to S. Peter and his Apoſtles, and in them to their Succeſſors, and neuer to the people. So that as a mã is ſayed to ſee, not that euery part of him ſeeth, but bicauſe one part which is the organ of the eye, ſeeth: ſo the Church is ſayed to haue the Keyes of heauen, bicauſe one part, to vvit the paſtours, who are the principal part of this myſtical body, & eſpecially yᵉ cheefe paſtour, hath them. This S. Bede auerreth: *Eccleſia quæ fundatur in Chriſto, claues ab eo regni cælorũ accepit in Petro*: The Church which is founded in Chriſt, receiued of him the Keyes of the Kingdom of heauen in Peter. Mat 16.18 Io.20. 21. in cap. 21. Ioan.

1. de fide ad Petrum. S. Fulgentius sayth *that God gaue to the Church powver of loosing and binding in the person of Peter.* Nether needed Sotcl. to feare leaſt in *a generall defectiō of the ordinarie Prieſts of the Church of Rome*, Miniſters vvould be vvanting vnleſſe the people could in that caſe ordain them, bicauſe nether the Church generally, nor the patticular Church of Rome ſhal fall, and ſo ſhee ſhal haue paſtours and preachers to the end, as by experience of the Churches firm ſtanding againſt ſo many & ſo cruel perſequutions may appear, as alſo by Chriſts promiſe vvho promiſed to eſtabliſh it on ſo ſure a rocke and fondation that the forces, and gates of hel ſhal not prævail againſt it. Butif the ordinarie Paſtours of the Church ſhould fal, yet in that caſe, nether doth it follovv, as Luther ſaith that *quando neceſſitas poſtulat quiſque debet ſeipſum intruderē tanquam neceſſitate charitatis fraternæ coactus*, vvhen neceſſitie requireth euery one is to intrude him ſelfe as conſtrained by neceſſitie of fraternal charitie; nether doth it follovv that in that caſe the people might ordain Miniſters: but only that in that caſe (vvhich yet is impoſſible) we were to expect extraordinarie preachers ſent immediatly frō God, vvho alſo if they vvould

Ephes. 4.

Mat. 16.

Luth. in c. 9. Mat.

be heard, ought to haue from God the povver to vvorke miracles, and by extraordinarie signes, to proue their extraordinarie vocation: Vvhich povver *Luther*, *Caluin*, and the rest neuer had, as *Sotcliffe* confesseth, though they haue assayed it, as I haue proued by credible autours and the common report of the vvorld, and *Sotcliff* to boldly and rashly, if not impudently deny eth. pag 8.

## *Sotcliffes answver to the drift of the argument of this first chapter, proued insufficient.*

1 IN this chapter I haue proued that preachers must be sent, and must also, proue their mission: vvhich ether is ordinarie, and so must be proued by succession, or extraordinarie, and so must be vvaranted by miracles. I haue demonstrated at large that *Luther*, and other nevv preachers vvhich rose in his tyme or after, can not shevv any lawfull succession, & so are not sent by an ordinarie mission: I haue also proued that they are not sent extraordinarilie, partly bicause the Church and her pastors shall continevv to the end, and so shal haue no extraordinarie preachers, partly bicause they could neuer worke miracles, wch yet must needs be the Mat. 16. Epiſe. 4.

proofe of an extraordinarie missiō. To this what answereth *Sot?* First, like wil Sōner not caring to defēd him selfe, bicause hee sees he can not, he strikes at his next neighbor, and
pag 6. saith, that *if successiō were the only proofe of an ordinarie mission, the Papists themselues were in hard termes.* But howw Papists can proue their succession I haue partly shewed, partly shal againe in the secōd booke and fifte chapter. The succession of the Popes S. Ireneus, S. Austin and S. Optatus by me cited do recken vp to their tyme, Eusebius to his tyme, and other historiographers, as *Genebrard, Baronius, D. Bristow, Iudocus Coccius*, and many others haue brought this succession to our tymes. And the succession of the Bishops of our countrie till the chaunge of Religion in King Edwards tyme, and of other Churches till this our vnhappie tyme, euery particuler Church can shewv, and one *Ioannes le Bœuf* Canon of Rhemes and Chācelour of the Vniuersitie, hath set out a Catalogue of the Arch-bishops of Remes euen to the Arch-bishop that nowv is: and one *Demochares* hath set dowvne the Catalogues of many other Churches of Fraunce and other countries, euen of our Ingland. And if *Sot:* can shewv such a Succession, vvhy asce leth

he no higher then to *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Bucer* in *Germanie*, *Farel* in *Fraunce*, *Knox* in *Scotland*, *Cranmer* in *England*?

3 Vvheras *Sote*: saith that they can shevv such a succession of Bishops as *Papists themselues can not controle*, it is but a bragg of a souldier, and his deriuing of his Bishops and ministers from our Bishops, I haue already declared to be ridiculous. Vvheras he addeth, *that the Greekes, Antiochians, and Ægiptians, pretend to this day Succession of Bishops, and yet are fallen grossely from the truth*: I answver that a personal succession vvithout degeneratiō from former faith & doctrine, is the proofe of an ordinarie missiō, and such a succession vve shevv in tvvo manners. First in the Church of *Rome*; Secondly in the vniuersal Church, vvhere in one place or other, still hath remained a visible succession of Pastours, who haue euer taught the same doctrine. As for the *Greeks*, though in some sort they haue continued a personal succession in their cheefest seates, yet since their reuolt from the Romain Church, and schisme and heresies, their successions haue been broken, interrupted, and vncertain, as *Genebrard* in his *Chronologie* and *Stapleton* in his controuersies do make manifest, and that by rea-

Geneb. l. 4 Chron. Stapl. l. 13. de defens. succeſſ. c. 6

son of the Saracens, to whose Tyrānie they haue been Subiect, since they refused to be Subiect to the *Romain Bishop*. But vvhat soeuer their Succession of one Bishop after another hath been: since their schism and heresie of the holy Ghost, and diuers other errours, although they might continevv a succession of Persons, yea and true Bishops, if they vsed the right form of ordination (because heretical Bishops by their vndefaceable caracter may consecrate and ordein) yet since their *schisme* and heresie, they had no true mission nor iurisdiction to preach and gouern their Churches. For nether their Catholike predecessors, nor the Bishop of *Rome* the suprem Pastour gaue them authoritie to preach heresie: & so since their schism and heresie, they runne vnsent, and preach vvithout calling, and so are no lavvfull Pastors, as I sayed of *Cranmer*. And therfore *Irenæus* saith not that vvee must obey al Bishops as our lavvfull pastors, vvho can deriue vvhat soeuer Succession, but vvho *cum Episcopatus Successione Charisma veritatis certum acceperunt*, vvith the Succession of the Bishoprick haue had also the sure guift of veritie. And such a succession Catholikes can shevv. But if *Sotcliff* vvil obstinatly

Lib. 4. c. 43.

stand to it, that the Popes of Rome and the ordinarie pastours in the vniuersal Church, *are fallen from the truth*, vvhy can not he, nor any of his fellovves assuredly name the first Pope, that degenerated in faith? As vve can point out the first heretical Patriarch in the Seates of Greece as Paulus (Samosatenus who brake the lyne of succession of Bishops in the Sea of Antioch, & Macedonius in the Sea of Cõstãtinople, & Dioscorus in the Sea of Alexãdria) and do name the first heretical Bishop of *Canterburie*, to vvit *Cranmer*, vvho first did varie from the faith of his prædecessours? And as other Atch-heretikes gaue names vnto their followers (as of Arius they vveer called Arians, of *Nestorius*, Nestorians, of Eutichius Eutichians &c.) vvhy vvere not vvee called *Bonifacians* of *Bonifacius* (vvhom some of you count the first Antichrist in the Sea of Rome) or by other names of some other Popes, if he or they first degenerated and drevv the Church with them into errour. Certes, if *Sotc.* could shovv but such a succession from his Prædecessors for a manour hovvse or Tenemẽt as vve can for our Church and for the lavvfull possession of Ecclesiastical seates and dignities vvhich our Pastors so long haue he-

den, the manour howse would bee adiudged vnto him in al courts of the world.

Beza ep. 1. Wherefore Beza graunteth that we can shewe a personal succession euen from the Apostles. But if they graunt vs a succession of persons, they must graunt vs a succession of spiritual power and doctrine, bicause Christ promised to *Peter* and al his successors that their faith should not fail, and that the gates of hel should not prœuail against them.

Mat. 16. Luc. 22.

3 *Sotcliff* perceiuing howe hard it is for him to proue his ordinarie Mission by Succession, would fayn that it were not necessarie, and wheras I haue alleaged *Tertulian* who bidds the heretikes of his tyme to *vnfold the order of their Bishops*, and so to proue themselues lawfull preachers: and S. Austen, who saith that this succession *holds him in the Church*, and that *there is the rocke of the Church, where is this succession of Bishops from S. Peters seat*: and in my second Edition haue added *S. Ciprian*, who excludeth *Nouatian* from the right to the *Popedom*, bicause he succeeded not lawfully to Pope *Fabian*: *Sotcliff* answereth that *Tertulian* and *S. Austin speake of Succession, but neither of them denyeth them to be Bishops or Pastors that are not ordeined*

Tertul. l. præscr. c. 32. Aug. psal. contr. Don. l. cont. ep. fund. Cipr. ep. ad Anton. & l. 1. ep. 6. ad Magnum sev ep. 77.

by a Bishop, who was ordered with al ceremo-
nies. Which his answer euidently crosseth
their words, which import that they are no
lawfull Pastours, who can not shew how
they succeed to former Pastours, as we haue
proued that *Sotel.* Ministers can not. What
thē can they say to maintein their succession
to the Apostles and ancient Bishops? *I haue*
*alleged* in their manes two answers. the
one, is, that they succeed to the Apostles &
first Bishops by interruption of many hun-
dred yeares: the other, that they succeed
without interruption but by an inuisible
succession. Both which answeres I haue
reiected, by prouing that the Church can Mat. 16.
neither fal being builded on a rocke, nor be-
come inuisible being a Citie on an Hill: and Mat. 5
if it could: how could *Martin Luther* and the
first new preachers, receiue commission and
ordination from Pastors, that either were
not, or were inuisible? But *Sotel:* moued
with a spirit of contradiction, denyeth that
they answer thus, as I make them, and gi-
ueth me the lye for saying so: and yet the pag. 7.
poor follow neither hath, neither can haue
any thing elsse to answere? For if he make
clayme to an ordinarie missiō he must shew
his Predecessors, that sent him and his, and

seing that it is more then euidēt, that there vvas neuer ether hard, or seen, or felt, any peece of his Church, or any Prelate or Pastour or Preacher therof before *Luther*, if hee vvill claime the Apostles and first Prelates for his predecessours, and yet can not name any of his Superintendēts and Ministers that by a cōtinuall line are descended frō thē hee must say, that ether the Church and Pastours fell for a tyme, or else became inuisible, till Luther peeped vp, and leaped out of his cloister. And thus those that are vvisest then Sotc. do answer. *Luther* graunteth such a defection of the Church, that it can not be pointed out, *cùm sit occultata & tantum vrebatur*, seing that it is hidden and only knovvn by faith: and again, saith he *Ciprianì & Tertuliani ætate degenerauit Ecclesia*, in Ciprians and Tertulians tyme the Church degenerated: and yet again he calles the Church *an hidden Margarit* and an *abiect, and hidden compānie*. The *Magdeburgians* bicause they vvould not be vrged to shevv a Succession of their Church and Pastors, haue defined it to be *a visible cōpany, but of poor, abiect and vnknovvn men to the vvorld*. *Caluin* saith that after lyes in doctrin, and peruerse vse of Sacraments, *Ecclesiæ interitus consequitur* the death of the Church

Luth. l. de abrogand. missa. in colloq. Lat. c. de pænit. l. de ieiuo arb. Mag. cent. 1. l. 1. c. 4. tit. de Eccles.

l. 4. Inst. c. 2. §. 1. & 2. cok. Gen. 1192. l. 4. c. 2. §. 1. §. 4.

Church followeth and he addeth that the Church *is a litle companie lurking in a great multitude, and a fewe grains of wheat couered with a heap of Chaffe*, and that therfor *soli Deo permittenda est cognitio Ecclesiæ suæ*, to God only is to be permitted the Knowledge of his Church. And again he saith that the Masse *being dronken in a golden chalice hath inebriated all kinges and peoples of the earth*. To be breefe, in his preface of his Institutions to the King of Fraūce, he bidds vs *tel in good sadnes where we place the Church since the Councel of Basil?* The Autour of the *Apologie* of the Church of England, endeuoureth to proue that the Church hath fallen both before and after Christ: and calleth *Luther* and *Zuinglius* the first men that illuminated the world, and caused the light of truth to appeare which before was *vnknowē and vnheard of*. So that *Soteliffe* that sayd I *lyed without commission* in charging them to say that the Church fel or became inuisible, lyeth him self; yet, in Caluins opinion, not without commission. For if God be the authour of sinne, as Caluin saith he is, then is he the autour of this lye, and if he not only permitteth but also willeth that we sinne, as the same Caluin auoucheth, then *Sot.* in lying hath fulfilled Gods

l. 4. c 1. §. 2 rdr. Gene. 1392.

l. 4. Inst. c. 18 §. 18.

Præfat. Instit.

pag. 160.

pag. 114.

pag. 7.

Sot. lyer.

l. 1 Instit. c. 18.

vvil, and so hath lyed by commission. Or if the Church nether fel nor became inuisible, she had euer visible Pastours, and so *Sotcl.* may shew vs to vvhom *Luther* and *Zuinglius* in Germanie, *Farel* and *Caluin* in Fraunce, *Crammer* in England, and *Knox* in Scotland succeeded, and by vvhom they vvere ordained and sent a preaching.

5 But because I haue *Sotcl.* in my hands, he shal not get away, til he say, that the Church fel, or vvas inuisible (if hee and his be the Church) and so confesse him selfe to be a lyer. And thus I vrge him. Vvhen Luther began to Preach, the Romain Church by *Sotcl.* confession vvas not the true Church. The *Bohemites*, and *Hussites*, vvere not the true Church by Luthers confession, for he renounceth them as Schismatikes, and saith they nether do, nether euer shal please him: nether were the *Grecians* this true Church, because they deny the holy Ghost to proceed from the Father which nether Lutherianes nor Caluinists do: nor the Æthiopiãs, because they, beside other heresies, hold Circumcision as necessarie: nor the *Armenians*, for they deny original sinne, which the new Church rather exaggerateth: nor the *Vvaldenses*, because they hold that ministers can

disp. Lyp. & n. 6. Gil. Coc. in actis an. 1519.

haue no tẽporal posſeſſion, to which the Inglish proteſtant Miniſters wil neuer aggree, they alſo held that Princes, Prelates, and Magiſtrates, looſe their Iuriſdiction by euerie mortal ſinne, and they confeſſed Purgatorie and the real preſence, vvhich our *Sect* cãnot brook: nether were the *Caluiniſts* this Church, bicauſe no Caluiniſts could be before *Caluin*, nor the Lutherans bicauſe no Lutherans before *Luther* nether vvas *Luther* this Church, bicauſe one man can not make a Church, it being a cõgregation, and he alſo vvas a Friar and a Papiſt, before he became to be a Lutheran, or of the Lutheran Religion. Nether can any other cõgregation be named, vvhich ſhould bee this Church, and conſequently, immediatly before Luthers preaching, if the nevv Church be the true Church, ether ther vvas no Church, or it vvas inuiſible, and ſo *Sorcliff* is a viſible and palpable lyer, or if he vvil obſtinately hold that his Church vvas before Luther, let him name ſome Biſhop of his Church, vvho impoſed hands vppon Luther, and ſent him to Preach. To ſay *that the ancient Biſhops, as they taught the Catholike faith and no more, were their predeceſſors*, is to ſay no more then *Arius* and euery Archeretike may ſay, bicauſe they ag-

greing in some points with them, might say they succeed thē in that they taught right, and left them in that they swerued from the truth. and who them shalbe Iudg who hath swerued? besides it is not sufficient to succeed the ancient Fathers in doctrin, but ther is also required lawful ordination and authoritie to make a lawful preacher, which cometh also by imposition of hands of a lawful Bishop, and this *Sotc.* can not shew, and consequently can not proue him selfe a lawful Minister.

6. Now *Sotcliff* hauing nothing to say for his ordinarie Mission: who ther as he should as an vsurper, haue renounced and deliuered vp his Deanrie & ministerie; like a souldiour that counts it dishonour to yeeld vp the Town before he hath endured the canon, he makes claym to an extraordinarie missiō, and will not yeeld, till you haue dispossessed him of that also. But whereas I proue that they who prætend an extraordinarie Mission without succession are false Preachers that run vnsent, bicause S. Paul saith *Christ hath giuē vs Pastours to the end*, and Christ promised to build his Church *on a rocke*, that it should need no new masons to rebuild it: and therfore S. *Ciprian*, and *Optatus*, by me

Ephes. 4. Mat. 16.

alleaged cal Preachers that say thy are sent immediatly & extraordinarilie from God, Schollers vvithout a Maister, and children vvithout a Father, yea Monsters, prodigiously born of them selues: vvheras I say that Christ neuer fortold that his Church and her Pastours should faly, or that they failing he would send extraordinarie preachers immediatly from him selfe, but rather forwarned vs of false Prophets vvho shal bragg that he sent them, vvhen they ran of them selues: wheras I also proue that if any should be sent extraordinarilie, they must proue their mission by miracles, as alwayes hether to they did, & as appeareth by the example of Moyses, Christe, the Apostles and others, vvhich yet Luther and Caluin could neuer do, though (vvhatsoeuer *Sotcl.* saith) they haue assayed: vvheras also they vvhich are extraordinarily called must receiue imposition of hands, as S. Paule did not vvithstanding his extraordinarie calling and miracles: *Sotcliff* answereth not to this, but saith only that I *take vppon me to arrogantly to limit Gods povver*, and yet I say not that God can not, but that he vvill not send extraordinarie Preachers: and then he as vvisely alleageth 4. chap. to the Ephesians to proue that God

Opt l. 1. & 1. cont. par. Cipt. l. 1. ep. 6.

pag. 8.

pag. 7.

Ephes 4.

vvil send extraordinarie preachers, as before he did to exclude the Pope, for that place only proueth that God giueth Pastours to the end, but by succession of one to another. He saith S. Ciprian and Optatus speake not against them but against intruding *Donatists* and *Nouatians*, and yet must needs confesse that they speake against his ministers also if they can shew no Predecessours: wheras he addeth that they speake against *Arch-priests Iesuites, and Masse-Preests*, he declares him self to be an Arch noddy. bicause they succeed to the ancient Preests of England by a continual succession, notwithstanding so many bloudie Statutes, Tiburns, rackes, and rack Maisters: & they are sent by the Pope vvho can proue his authoritie, by a long lyne of succession, that reacheth to S. Peter. Vvherfore I vse this *Dilemma*: either *Luther* in Germanie, *Farel* in Geneua, *Knox* in Scotland, and *Cranmer* in England, from vvhom proceed the Frye of al the nevv ministers, were sent by an ordinarie mission or extraordinarie. If by an ordinarie let *Sotcliff* tel me what former Bishops sent them and imposed hands vppon them, for this saith Caluin is necessarie, *ne homines inquieti ac turbuleti temere se ad docendum vel regendum ingererent*, least vn-

l. 4. c. 3. §. 10. 14. 16.

quiet and trouble ſom men, ſhould raſhly intrude them ſelues to teach and gouern. If by an extraordinary miſſion from God, let them ſhevv their miracles, for they as, I haue proued are neceſſarie to proue an extraordinarie miſſiō. And ſo as *Luther* vvrote to the Senat of *Mulhuſe* vvhether *Muncer* vvas fled, that they ſhould do vvel to aſk of him, *quis docendi munus ipſi commiſerit, &c.* vvho gaue him authoritie to teach, and if he name God the authour, then let them bid him proue this his vocatiō by ſome euident ſigne: ſo ſay I to Luther. Ex Sledan. l. 3. hiſt.

7. Vve haue ſeen how *Sotcliff* like a man halfe drovvned (vvho bicauſe he knovves not hovv to ſaue him ſelfe catcheth at euery thing that comes nere him) hath vſed al-meanes poſſible to defend his miſſion, and thoſe ſo diuers, that the verie diuerſitie argueth, that he knovves no determinat defence for his preachers miſſion. For firſt he vvould not haue faith to depend on preachers, that if he fail in prouing his preachers miſſion, it may not ſeem material; then he chalengeth an ordinatie miſſion and ordination of his Miniſters from Catholike Biſhops: that not ſerning his turn, he ſaith inferiour Miniſters may ordain others, and

bicause he savv that nether Superiour nor inferiour Ministers sent *Luther* in Germanie, *Cranmer* in Ingland *Farel* in *Geneua* (bicause they vvere the first in these countries of their familie) he saith the people may appoint ministers in a defection of ordinarie Pastors: lastly finding difficultie in defending an ordinarie vocatiõ, he seems to make claim to an extraordinarie, vvhich yet he vvil not be compelled to proue. Vvherfore now that I haue disproued these new preachers mission, and so plainly also, that they neuer shalbe able to answer, I vvil inferre tvvoe conclusions; the first, that our reformers haue nether true faith nor vvorship of God. for if faith depend of hearing, hearing of preaching, preaching and administratiõ of Sacraments, of ministers and preachers, and preachers and ministers of their mission, vvhere there is no mission, there can be no true faith nor lavvfull administration of Sacraments, and consequently no Religion. The second shalbe the conclusion of the first Chapter of my surucy, vvhich is, that if vve receue these our nevv ministers for lavvfull preachers, they being nether able to proue their mission to be ordinarie, by succession, nor extraordinarie,

the 1. conclus.

Ro. 10.

The 2. concl.

by miracles, we can refuse no false prophets; for they also will say they were sent to preach, and can not be excluded, if these mẽ vpon their bare wordes bee receiued without al proofe of their mission. This argument hath been often vrged by Catholikes against the newe preachers, but was neuer yet answered, and which is more, nether will, nether can be answered; and so that Bishop, who at the conference at Hampton court, bragged that hee would renounce his Bishopricke if hee could not proue his vocation, may keepe it long enough, if hee keepe it, till that promise be performed.

## The somme of the second chapter.

*THis chapter sheweth it to haue been an vsual custome of al heretikes to alleage Scriptures for their heresies, though they had no right so to doe, but yet they interpreted them as they pleased, and so alleaged no true scripture but only the letter: bicause scripture is cõposed not only of the letter but also of the true meaning: thẽ this chapter proueth that the bare letter of scripture with a volũtarie sense, is no good iudge to determin controuersies in religion, bicause so, it*

*may serue euerie heretike. Vvher as Luther and others do answver that scripture is plaine and easie and so a sufficient iudge, it is proued at larg that it is obscure and ambiguous euen in things necessarie to saluatiō and reasons therof are giuen. Vvherfore seing that the nevv preachers of this tyme bring no other proofe for their religion, then scriptures sensed, not as the Church defineth but as they themselues vvil imagin, they say no more for their religiō, then old heretikes did, & haue no more assurance of it then they had: and so, to giue eare to these nevv preachers for so alleaging scripturs, is to open the gapp to al heretikes, vvho alleaging the same authoritie, can not be reiected, if the nevv preachers be receiued.*

*Sotcliffes Answver, vvith the Reply against it.*

1. SOtcliff, after so many foiles taken in the former conflict, being as it seemeth vvearied and tyred vvith Shifting, Shuffling, and strouggling to defend his *Calling*: novv, as a man spent and quite out of breath, answvereth nothing at al to the drift of this argument. only he denyeth the conclusion: saying that the faithful *are built vppon the Apostles and Prophets*, and that the vvord of God *is the Svvord of the Spirit*,

Ephes 2. Ephes 6.

and *is profitable to instruct and reproue* (al vvch is true vvhen the true meaning is aggreed on) *but nether* (saith he) *may the ground of faith be termed a gate to heresies nor the svvord a meanes to bread heresies.* You a deuine M. *Sot*: you a common post to answere bookes, and yet to answer in this manner? I haue proued at large, that scriptures are hard and ambiguous, & that, to alleage scriptures only with a voluntarie meaning, is to alleage no more thē al heretikes haue done, & that therfore, your Preachers bringing no better proofe, if vve giue eare to them, vve must har ken to al heretikes: and you answer only, that scripturs being a fondation, and sword, and canon of faith, can not be a gate to heretikes: vvhich is not to answer, ether to *maior* or *minor*, but only to deny the conclusion, to wit, that to alleage Scripture only, and therfore to chalenge credit, is not to open the gapp to al heretikes. But if this be to answer, the verieſt idiot may answer the greateſt Doctour, and moſt irrefragable argument: bicause an Asse can deny more then an Aristotle can proue. But Giue me leaue Sir *Sot*. cōtrarie to my nature, to shew by a ridiculous Syllogism of Sophists, hovv ridiculous such your answers are. If a 1. Tim. 3.

Scholler of *Cambridg*, or *Oxford*, ſhould vſe this argument againſt you: *Vvhat you haue not loſt, that Stil you haue: But hornes you haue not loſt, ergo, hornes you haue.* And you ſhould anſwer to no propoſition, nor ſhew vvhere the fallacie lyeth, but only rubbing your brovv, ſhould ſay, that vvhat ſoeuer the argument proueth, you are ſure that your forhead is ſo ſmoath, and your vvifes carriage ſo vpright, (vvhich I alſo vvil not cal in queſtion) that you can haue no hornes: vvould not the Scholler laugh you to ſcorn, and might he not iuſtly tel you, that if you haue not hornes, yet at leaſt you deſerue lõg eares for ſuch an anſvver. And yet this is your anſvver, to deny forſooth the concluſion, & this is your ordinarie anſvver, as vve ſhal ſee hereafter. But bicauſe he can not anſwere, he ſupplieth anſvvering vvith lying, in vvhich facultie he deſeruedly meriteth the preheminence aboue moſt of his fellow vvriters.

pag. 10. 2. His firſt ly is this: *our Sauiour Mat. 4. by ſcriptures only ouercam the Deuil.* That this is a

1. lye. ly, it is manifeſt, bicauſe the deuil oppoſed Scriptur, to Scriptur, and ſo Chriſt ouercam him not by Scriptur only. And if *Sot:* anſvver that the Deuil alleaged Scripture in a falſe, Chriſt in a true meaning: I graunt it.

But vvho vvas to Iudg that? Christ, saith *Sotc*: And then say I, Scriptur only conuinced not the Deuil, but scriptur sensed by a lavvful interpretour, as Christ vvas, vvho proued his authoritie by prophecies and miracles. And seing that he made Peter cheef pastour vnder and after him selfe, and that the Pope is Peters succeſſor, as partly is proued, partly shalbe herafter, he is a lavvful interpretour and pastour: And *Sotcliffe* that can not proue his mission, alleageth no more for his religiõ, thẽ the deuil did againſt Christe, which is bare scripture, without autentical interpretation. Io. 21.

3. His second lye goeth thus: *nether did the anciẽt Fathers, by other vveapons, præuail againſt heretickes.* Vvhy then doth S. Austen, proue original finne by the authoritie of *S. Ireneus, S. Cyprian, Rheticius, Olympius, Hilarius, S. Ambroſe, S. Gregorie Nazianzen, S. Hierom, S. Baſil,* and *S. Chryſoſtome.* Vvhy doth he proue the Church by succeſſion, the Ghospel by the Church? vvhy doth Tertulian refuse to dispute vvith heretickes by only scriptures, *in quibus* (saith he) *aut nulla, aut incerta victoria, aut parum certa,* in which ether is no victorie, or vncertain, or litle certain, and he giues the reason, bicause they vvil ether deny thẽ pag. 10. 2. lye. l. 2. cont. Iul. l. cont. ep. Fund. Tert. l. de. c. 17. & 19.

or glosse them as they list: rather Tertulian
1 præscr. c. 20. 32. puttes them to proue their succession, and to shevv their conformitie vvith antiquitie and so he confounderh them. Vvhy doth
l. 2. cont. hær. c. 2. Ireneus refute the *Gnosticks* by Tradition, from the Apostles and succession of Popes from S. *Peter* to S. *Eleutherius*, vvhich he saith, *is plenissima ostensio, vnam & eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in Ecclesia ab Apostolis vsque nunc sit conservata & tradita in veritate*, a most ful demonstration that it is one and the same viuificating faith, vvhich in the Church, from the Apostles vntil now, hath been conserued and deliuered in veritie?

3. lye. 4. His third ly is couched in these vvords: *In General Councels of old tyme, not the Popes Decretals, but the holy Scriptures vvere layed before the Fathers.* That this is a ly, the Councels them selues do witnesse. For although in the Councel of Nice, and other Councels, the
Ex Conc. Calcedon. Act. 1. Ghospel was put in the Midst of the Assembly, to signifie that Christ, in vvhose name they vvere gathered, vvas cheef Præsident,
Psal. 81. *vvho in the midst, iudgeth the lesser Gods*: yet as *Athanasius* vvitnesseth, the Fathers euen of
Athan. ep. de Syn. Arim. & Seleu. the first *Nicen* Councel, decreed not any nevv doctrin, but that vvhich was deliuered by Tradition, and therfor in the matter of

the Trinitie they sayd *Sic credit Ecclesia*, thus the Church beleeueth, and vvhen they decreed that the Eastern Church should obserue *Easter*, as the *Romain*, and *Alexandrian* Church did, they sayd *visum est*, it seemeth good to vs. And Boxol our countriman found the Actes of that Councel in the Librarie of *S. Antonie* in *Venice*, where are these vvords of these Fathers: *hanc à maioribus nostris Sanctissimis qui fidem ab Apostolis religiosè conseruarunt, doctrinam veram & indubitatam per manus traditam accepimus*: this true and vndoubted doctrin vvee haue receued as deliuered from hand to hand, from our Ancesters, vvho religiously conserued Faith from the Apostles. In the same Councel *ἰσαριανὸν* vvas defined, which the Arians called *exoticum* bicause it vvas not in Scripture. In the Councel of *Constantinople*, *Theodosius* the Emperour, by *Nectarius* his suggestion, asked the heretikes, vvhether they vvould yeeld any thing to their forfathers? they answvering yea: he demaunded further vvhether they vvould take them for sufficient vvitnesses of Christian doctrin? But they smelling vvhether the Emperours speech tended, and Knovving that they taught othervvise then their forfathers, began to stagger

apud Iind. l. 1. Panop. pag. 71.

Ex Socrat. hist. Trip. l. 9. c. 19. in Epitome.

and from staggering fel to diuision amongst them selues, some content, some refusing, to be iudged by the ancient fathers. And in the same councel, vvheras Macedonius denyed the Holy Ghost to be God, bicause, as he sayd, it vvas not expressed in Scriptur, S. *Gregorie Nazianzen* saith it vvas to be beleeued, bicause those Fathers deduced it out of Scriptur. The third general Councel was holden at *Ephesus* against Nestorius, who distinguished two persõs in Christ, & the one he sayd vvas God only, the other man only called *Iesus*, and so he sayd that the blessed *Virgin Marie* vvas mother of *Iesus* but not of *God*. Notvvithstanding S. *Ciril* auoucheth, though it bee not written, yet it is to be beleeued, *bicause the diuine disciples deliuered it vnto vs, and thus vve are taught of our holy Fathers.* And S. *Vincentius Lyrinensis* commendeth the humilitie of the same Fathers, that they vvould deuise noe noueltie, but only defined *vvhat they receiued from their forfathers*, and to that end, *it seemed best to them that the sentences of the fathers should be proposed in the Councel.* The fourth general Councel vvas assembled at *Chalcedon* against *Eutiches*, who obstinately stood to it, that there vvas but one nature in Christ, bicause he found it not

lib. 5. de Theol.

ep. 1. to. 4.

Leõt. pro phan. hær. noui. c. 4.

in

in Scriptur expressed that he had two: but the Bishops cryed out, *ea quæ sunt Patrum, tenentur*: let those things be holden which our Fathers taught, and *Eudoxius* pronounced thus: *Omnis qui non consentit SS. Patrum expositionibus, seipsum alienat ab omni Sacerdotali communione & a Christi præsentia*; euerie one that consenteth not to the Expositions of the holy Fathers, doth alienate him selfe from al vvedlly cõmunion and from Christs presence. So that not only by Scripturs, but also by Tradition, and authorine of the ancient Fathers, yea by the authoritie of the Counell, heretikes haue been conuinced in ancient Councels. And certes if no authoritie should be giuen to the ancíet Church, and Fathers, nor to the Counce lit selfe, but only the scripture, should be layed between the Fathers of the Counce and the heretikes, what vvtangling would ther be, vvhen the heretikes should oppose scriptur to scriptur, and exposition to expositiõ, and none but scriptur, vvhich is obscure, and interpreteth not her selfe, should determin the controuersie? Act. 1.

5. His fourth ly is this: *thus our aduersaries* (counting me for one) *aduancing the Popes Decretals &c. detest the holy Scripturs.* & again: 4. lye.

*If then Kellison will needs follow heretikes in*
pag. 40. edit. 1. & pag. 22. Edit. 2. *calumniating Scriptures &c.* Against this ly, I oppose myn own words which are these: *For if they giue vs the letter of scripture with the true meaning, which is the formal cause and life of the word, we will reuerence it as the word of God, and præferr it before all writinges of Popes and Church.* and againe: *wherefore when*
pag. 41. edit 1. pag. 22. edit. 2. *the letter of scripture is ioyned with the right meaning, then doe we graunt, though men wrote it, that is the word of God &c.* And yet againe
pag. 42. & 43. edit. 1. & pag. 23. edit. 2. after a long commẽdation of scripture, and a great difference which I put betwixt the Popes decrees and scripture, I giue the præcedence and præeminence to scripture. But yet I proue that the bare letter is noe more scripture thẽ the bodie is a man without a soule.

1. 1. edit. but pag. 19 in 2. edit. 6. His fifte lye is this: *Of holy scripture the prophane fellow* (soe this Robin good fellow pleaseth to terme mee) *speaketh if not blasphemously yet basly and contemptibly pag: 36. he compareth them to colours vsed by fowle women, and to sweet odours vsed by slattes.* And yet it is not I, but *S. Vincẽtius Lyrinesis*, who makes the comparaison, and that verie aptly, as the reader will see if he please to pervse that place.

5. lye.

7. His sixt ly is this: *pag: 39. he calleth them bare, and compareth them to a nose of vvaxe, and allovveth the saying of one that compared them to Æsopes fables.* But I only say that *bare scripturre*, that is, the bare letter, is of a *vvaxie nature*, and as pliable to diuers expositions, as vvaxe is to take different impressions. And this I prone, bicause diuers heretikes, draw the same letter to diuers meanings. Then I say that *Luther calleth scripture the booke of heretikes, an other cõpareth it to Æsopes fables, others call scripture a nose of vvaxe*: So that I make not these comparaisons, but only relate the cõparisons of others: and then I add: *vvhich comparisons although they be odious, and little beseming the maiestie of scripture: yet are they true if by scripture you vnderstand the bare letter of scripture.* And my reason is, becausse the bare letter may be applyed to diuers, and those most absurd heresies, as dayly experience doth lamentably demonstrate by the practise of soe many heretiques, vvho all differently alleadge the letter of scripture for the vpholding of their nevv hatched opinions. but pag. 21 edit. 2.

8. The seuenth lye is thus delivered: *he shameth not pag 41. to say that the vvord of God vvith a false meaning is the vvord of the diuel.* but in this alsoe he imitateth his father the but pa. 22. edit. 2. 7. lye.

diuel, vvho is the father of lying, for I say only that the same letter vvith a true meaning: is the vvord of God, vvith a false meaning, is the vvord of the diuel: vvhich is a farre differēt speach from that which *Sotcliff* fathereth vpon me. for as I affirme there, the vvord is compounded of the sound or letter, and the sense or meaning: and that is as the matter, this as the forme, that as the bodie, this as the soule, and so the vvord of God, is not the letter only, but the letter vvith a true sense and meaning, and consequently the vvord of God can not haue a false meaning, nether can it be the vvord of the deuil: but the same letter as it may haue a true and false meaning, soe vvith a true meaning it is the vvord of God, vvith a false sense it is the word of the deuil. And I bring for an example those vvords of Christ: *The father is greater then I*: vvhich in the Arrians meaning are an heresie, and soe the word of the deuill, in the Churches meaning are true faith, and soe the vvord of God: vvhich *Sotc*: had not the vvit to cōceue. And therfore as Caluin sayd of the Lutherans vvho bragged of Scriptur, as vvel as he, *Excipiunt se Dei verbum habere quo palam facta est Dei voluntas &c.* They obiect that they haue the

What is the vvord of God.

Ioan. 14.

l. 4 Inst. c. 17. §. 25.

vvord of God by vvhich Gods vvil is made ma- Heretiket
nifest: Indeed if to them be graunted to banish haue not
the gift of interpreting out of the Church, vvhich the vvord
may giue light to the vvord: I confesse they haue the of God.
vvord, but such as the Anthropomorphites had
vvhen they made God corporal, and such as Mar-
cion and the Manichees had, when they fained that
Christ had a celestial or phantastical body: The
same say I of Sotcliffes Ministers, for the true
word of God they haue not, hauing not the
true meaning, vvhich is that vvhich makes
it the vvord of God.

9. His eight lye thus runneth: *that I wrong-
fullie charge Luther, for contemning S. Iames his
Epistle, that I doe iniurie to Luther and Caluin
in saying they misconster S. Paules Epistles: and
againe to Luther, in saying that he discanoneth Iob,
resteth at Ecclesiastes, contemneth all the Ghospells
but only that of S. Iohn, reiecteth the Epistle to
the Hebrevves, and the epistle of Iudas.* But my
iustification shall proue Sotcliffe to be as
he is. Touching Saint Iames Epistle the-
se are Luthers vvordes, and this is his cen-
sure: *D. Iacobi vere straminea est Epistola, si ad* Præfat. in
*aliae comparetur: non enim habet Euangelicum ve-* nou. Test.
*num*; vvhich comparison is odious, and the in Germ.
reason iniurious to that Epistle. Yea in the edit. 1.
same preface according to the impression of Ibidem.

lib. captiu. Bab. c. de exc. Vict. *Iena*, he saith: *epistola Iacobi contentiosa, tumida, arida, straminea, indigna est Apostolico Spiritu.* And in another place, *hanc Epistolam non esse Iacobi nec Apostolico spiritu dignam valde probabiliter asserunt.* And yet againe, *per opera tantum per fructus cognoscitur fides & iustitia, non autem sequitur, vt Iacobus deliret, igitur fructus iustificant.* Touching my other assertion, to wit that *Luther* and *Caluin* haue miscõstrued S. Paules Epistles, I proue it in my seuenth booke, where we shall see how our *Sotcliff* answereth it. Touching that I sayd that *Luther* discanoneth *Iob*, I verifie it out of *Luthers* owne mouth. For in his conuiuiale sermens he sayth, that the booke of Iob is *veluti fabulæ argumentum ad proponẽdum patientiæ exemplum*, & againe he plainly telleth vs that he beleueth not all things soe to haue hapned, *vt in libro Iob narrantur*, as they are related in Iob. Concerning the booke of Ecclesiastes one Henry Peter Rebenstock affirmeth this of Luther. *Martinus Lutherus Ecclesiasten cum legisset, dicebat: hic liber non est perfectus, multa abrepta sunt: neque ocreis, neque calcaribus indutus est, hoc est nullum habet perfectam sententiam, equitat in arundine longo, sicut ego dum essem Monachus in Monasterio.* Of the first three Ghospells this is this new Euan-

in cap. 22. Gen.

tit. de lib. noui & veteris test.

tit. de Patriarch. & Propher.

l. 2. colloq. Iat Luth. c. clever. test.

gelists opinion: he affirmeth that the opinion of fovver Ghospells is to be abolished, and that the Ghospel of S. *Iohn* is the *only goodly, true, and principall Ghospel*, and that S. *Paules Epistles doe farre excell the former three Ghospells.* And in his *prologue* to the Epistle to the *Hebrevves*, he sayth that this Epistle is nether the Epistle of S. *Paul* nor of any other Apostle, because, sayth he, it conteyneth thinges repugnaunt to the Euangelicall and Apostolicall doctrine. Lastly in his *Preface to the Epistle of* S. *Iames*, speaking of the sayd *Epistle* he pronounceth this sentence against it: *Et si hanc Epistolam non improbo, non tamen opus est vt in Canonem referatur.* Although I doe not condemne this Epistle yet I find noe need vvhy it should be admitted for Canonicall. And in the same place he sayth that it vvas not the vvorke of any Apostle but of some disciple, vvho a long tyme after the Apostles, compiled it out of the second Epistle of S. *Peter*. He addeth that the authour of this Epistle *citeth scriptures vvhich are noe vvhere extant.*

in sepcticip. c 5. & præf. in nouum testam. ex Coel. de scrip & Eccles. auct. & Bel. to. 1. l 1. c. Luth. prol. ep. ad Heb sic Magd. cent. 1. l 2. cap. 4. de scrip. noui test. & l. contra Amb. Catha.

10. The ninth lye vvhich proceeds from his barren inuention is this: he sayth that I falsifie scriptures in saying *pag.* 46. *that scripture her selfe confesseth her owne obscuritie.* 9. lye.

And howv good man *Sot.* doe I falsifie scripture in thus saying? Bicause I alleadg only S. Peters Epistle, vvhich sayth *so*, and vvhich is not all, but a parte of scripture. But seing that denominations are of the vvhole subiect: as I may say *Sotcliff* hath noe vvit, because his head is besotted, soe may I say that scripture confesseth her owne obscurity, bicause S. *Peters epistle*, which is a part of scripture, auoucheth, that in S. *Paules* Epistles (another parte of scripture) *are certaine*
1. Pet. 3. *thinges hard to be vnderstood*. But sayth he, S. *Peter affirmeth not that the scriptures are obscure, as this Kellison pretendeth, but only that certaine thinges in S. Paules Epistles are difficult.* O the vvit of this man. Beeit, that the difficultie of scriptures proceed not of the ambiguitie or obscuritie of the stile and phrase, but only from the difficultie of the thinges handled in scripture, as *Trinitie, Incarnation, Iustification, Predestination*, and such like, yet doth it not (I pray you) hence followv, that scriptures, are hard and obscure, & soe without an interpretour are noe fit rule for vs to square religion by? as for example one hath made an English logicke, and your Ministers haue translated the bible into English, and yet are both of those bookes hard, euen

in those places vvhere the English phrase is vvell knowne. But I haue proued also that the verie stile of Scripture is hard, by reason of the ænigmaticall, figuratiue, and prophetical phrases, and the ambiguitie of the letter: and to this I require Sorchiffes answer. Certes the Greeke copies doe argue both these difficulties, because some haue ἐν οἷς some ἃ εἶπε that is *in vvhich thinges* or *in vvhich epistles are certain thinges hard to be vnderstood.*

11. His tenth lye affirmeth thath I cite Luther partially concerning the plaines of scripture. But of this also let *Luthers* vvordes giue sentence. In his *præface* to his *assertions condemned by Pope Leo the X.* of that name, thus he pronounceth: *Oportet scripturæ iudice hîc ferre sententiam, quod fieri non potest nisi scripturæ dederimus principem locum in omnibus quæ tribuuntur patribus, hoc est vt sit ipsa per se certissima, facillima, apertissima, sui ipsius interpres, omnia probans, iudicans, ac illuminans.* here vve see he calles Scriptur most easie, most open, and the interpreter of it selfe. And againe, *hoc sanè fateor esse multa loca in scripturis obscura & abstrusa, nõ ob maiestatem rerũ, sed ob ignorantiã vocabulorũ & Grammaticæ, sed quæ nihil impediat scientiam omnium rerũ in scripturis. Res in scripturis sunt omnes proditæ, licet quædam loca, adhuc verbi in-*

10. lye.

Præfat. in Assert.

l. de ser. arbi.

*cognitio obscura sunt.* And yet a littell after: *Si vno in loco obscura sunt verba, at in alio loco clara. Igitur tu & omnes sophistæ, agite & producite vnum aliquod mysterium quod sit in scripturis adhuc abstrusum: quod verò multis, multa manent obscura, non hoc fit scripturæ obscuritate, sed illorum cæcitate vel socordia, qui non agunt vt clarissimam lucem videant.* Tel me novv *Sotcliff* vvhether that I cite Luther partially cõcerning his opiniõ of the playnes of scripture: or vvhether thus you deserue not the greatest whetstone in all the cutlers shoppes in fleet streat for soe many lyes and belyinges.

pag. 10. 12. Besides soe many lyes he carpes at me *for running* (as he saith) *into a large feild concerning the possession of scriptures*: vvhich I proue to pertain to Catholiques, as to the true & lavvful ovvners, by the right of præscription. But *Sot:* sayth that *this can not make for papistes vvhom he hath proued in a booke*, I neuer hard of, to be heretikes: and then he sayth that *this discourse of the possession of scripturs vvas not to the purpose*. But vvhether he and his, or I & mine be heretiks, wee shall see in the next booke: in the meane tyme, he should haue answered my argument grounded in præscriptiõ. I alleadg that wee haue had the custodie of scripturs euen from

præscriptiõ giues to Cath. Scripturs.

the Apoſtles, & noe heretike that pleadeth againſt vs, can name any other later tyme of this our poſſeſſion: and ſoe vvee are lavvfull poſſeſſors by right of præſcription. For if by the Ciuill lavv, a long tyme be ſufficient to præſcribe and to get a lavvfull poſſeſſion euen of goodes immoueable; and if ten yeares be counted a long tyme betvvixt thoſe that are preſent: and twenty, between the abſent, & that by the decree of the ſame lavv: if thirty or forty yeares be counted *longiſſimum tempus*, and ſufficient, euen without a title, to a lawfull poſſeſſion, then much more may our præſcription of ſixteen hundred yeres, make vs lavvfull poſſeſſours of ſcripturs. And if vve be lawfull owners then *Sot:* & his miniſters are theeues that vſe thē and alleadge them againſt our vvills, and againſt vs alſoe. But becauſe our doctour of lavv is not vvorth a ſtravv, he anſvvereth not to this, yet vvill he and his vſe and alleadge ſcripturs for a coulour: but taking the letter of vs vvithout the true meaning vvhich vve receiued frō the Apoſtles vvith the letter, they haue but the bare letter vvch is not ſcripture, and the letter being ambiguous, they open the gates to all heretikes vvho euer haue alleadged the letter, and ſoe can not be reiected if *Sot:* & his be receiued.

Inſt. de vſucap. § 1. l. eum in lōgi. C. de præſc. lōgi temporis.

c. 5. & 8. de præſcr. l. 6 quis Empt §. 2. C. de præſcr. 30. vel 40. ann Conar. l. 2. var. reſol. c. 17. n. 7.

the concluſion.

## The somme of the third chapter.

IN the third chapter after a little præface, exordium, or introduction, which sheweth how we euery man by nature, not ruled by reason nor corrected by grace, falleth most willingly in loue with him selfe, his owne actions and opinions (which also I illustrate by examples of vnreasonable creatures) I shew by the proud speeches of diuers heretikes both of former and later stading, how all heretiks, and especially those of these our tymes, are deeply infected with this sue pleasing a disease: which in other matters is called selfe loue, in matters of religion, a priuat spirit. By this spirit, I shew how heretikes square out religion, and giue sentence of the scriptures meaning: but what an absurd iudge this is, I proue by many arguments, of which the last is, because this spirit openeth the gappe to all heretiques,

### Sotcliffes Answer with the refutation.

TO all this and to all these arguments Sotcliffe answereth nothing, only still, like vvill Sommer, not caring to saue him

ſelfe from a broken pate, he ſtriketh at his next neighbour. *This* (ſaith he) *launceth the Pope deeply but toucheth not vs.* But as for the Popes ſpirit hovv it is noe priuat but a publicke ſpirit, and vvhat aſſurance vve haue of it, & how it is not the only rule or Iudge in the Catholike Church, I haue ſhevved in this ſelfe ſame chapter: and ſoe it *launceth not the Pope*, nor doth it touch Papiſts, vvho are ruled by the publicke ſpirit of the Church, to vvhich Chriſt him ſelfe promiſed his holy ſpirit to *teach her all veritie.* As for *Sotcliffe* and his miniſters, how this tovvcheth them neerly, and launceth them deeply, his dumme deuil that poſſeſſeth him, bevvrayeth by his ſilence: becauſe he anſvvereth nether to my argumentes, nor the drifte of my diſcourſe, which is to ſhevv hovv this ſpirit openeth the gapp to all hereſies: only like a dogg that dares not come near, he bavvleth and barketh at certaine of my by ſpeches, and like a vice in a play, pleaſantly, but fooliſhly ieſteth at my *exordium*, carping at covves, hennes, and chickens, by me mentioned in the *exordium*, more to the purpoſe (as the reader vvill perceiue) then *Sotcliffe* maketh ſhevv. but to vvhat purpoſe he carpeth at covves, hennes and chickings I ſee

The Popes ſpirit not priuat.

pag. 48. lin. 5. edit. 1.

Io. 14. & 16.

Sotcliffe ieſting.

not, vnlesse, bicause he vvas an old enemie of such cattle, vvhen he vvas a souldier, and killed farre moe of them, then of his Princes enemies.

2. But to shew in particuler, that this my discourse of the priuat spirit toucheth *Sotcl.* to the quicke, and soe, that it vvould make him leap like a *spiritato*, if he were not a thick-skind fellow: I demaund of, *Sot.* vvhat assurance he hath of his religion? if he answvere scripture, I vrge him to tell me hovv he knoweth these books to be scripture? and if he vvill answver cõsequently to his owne opinion, he must confesse that neyther by the Romaine Churche, nor by tradition of scripture from hand to hand, which only is found in her, and vvhich in other thinges he and his reiect: nor by the phrase or maiestie of scripture, vvhich may easily deceiue and hath deceiued as many as haue denied some partes of scripture: But he must answver with his maister Caluin, by the *inward spirit*, which only (sayth he) can giue vs a firme assurauncc of scripture. and yet this is soe firm, that *Luther* by his spirit, denied S. *Iames* Epistle: Caluin by his spirit, graunteth it: and soe *Sotcliffe* must ground him selfe on his priuat spirit. Then I vvill tell him, that

l.1.c.7 &c. 8.in fine. Luth.sup. col.in arg. epist.Iac.

it is not ſufficient to alleadge aſſured ſcripture, becauſe heretiques alleadge them, as vvell as true Chriſtians, as in the former chapter is declared If *Sotcliff* anſwer that hetetiques and Papiſtes, alleadge ſcripture in a falſe, but he and his miniſters, in a true meaning: I demand to knovv of him hovv I ſhall knovv, yea how he him ſelfe ſhall, or can knovv, that? And then, he hauing reiected the Church and with it alſoe tradition, (as Caluin in the places alleadged affirmeth that it is abſurd to ground our firme knovvledge of ſcripture or the meaning of it vpon the Church, or men, or humain meanes, he muſt needs anſvver that the invvard ſpirit aſſureth him that he and his haue the true meaning of ſcripture. And ſeing that all heretikes can alleadge alſoe their ſpirit, and ſay, and ſweare alſoe, that this ſpirit aſſureth them, *Sotcliffe*, in thus grounding his knowledge of ſcripture vppō the ſpirit, openeth the gap to all heretiques, and hath noe more aſſurance of his faith, then they haue, they thinking them ſelves as aſſured as he. Speake novv *Sotc.* and tell vs vvhether this toucheth you not to the quicke, and vvhether indeed it draweth not bloud of you? But *Sotc.* is poſſeſſed by a dumme deuill, and

Sot. touched.

therfore because he can not speake, I will answer for him, as *Calain* his maister hath taught him to answer.

supra.

3. He will say that though every heretique may bragg of his spirit, yet spirits must be tried by scripture. But thé this blind mil-horse runneth in the circle by me mentioned, in this chapter. for euē now he proued scripture and the meaning of scripture, by the spirit, and now he proueth his spirit, by scripture, and if I aske him, how he knoweth that this scripture which he alleageth for his spirit, is true scripture, or thus to be vnderstood, he will say, by his spirit: and if I request him to tell how he knoweth this last spirit, he will say by scripture, and soe will runne a rounde and endlesse circle, till his head be dissie, and his braynes turn with turning, and him selfe become a *Spirito*, or a Bedlam burgesse benummed of his senses. This lashe and whipp, though he be a thickskind fellow, so toucheth our *Sotel*: that it maks him leape like a Bedlam, and soe it bringes him to him selfe, that now he is contented to answer. He sayth: true, wee relie on the spirit, but not on the priuat and phantasticall spirit, which heretikes alledge, *but on the spirit of God that either speaketh*

p. 77. edit. 1. & p. 41 edit. 2.

Sotc. runnes in a circle.

*keth plainly, or expoundeth him selfe in some other place: And besides* (sayth he) *vve vse the helpe of tounges and exposition of Fathers, histories, and all other good meanes, neyther did Luther think or proceed otherwise.* Thus this man answereth, but soe, as you may see, hee is retourned to his ould Phrenesey. He sayth he relies *on the spirit of God that eyther speakes playnly or expoundeth him selfe in some other place.* But thus he proueth his spirit to be of God by scripture, and soe runneth the circle afore-sayd, because as he proueth his spirit by scripture, soe he proueth scripture by his spirit, as I haue already told him. Novv vvheras he sayth that eyther the spirit *is playne or else it expoundeth it selfe by some other place*, that is refuted in the former chapter, vvher I haue demonstrated, that scripture is obscure and can not allvvaies be cleared by conference of places, but rather soe is sometymes more endarkned, because by conference, a supposed contradiction appeareth, vvhich before this collation of places vvas not espied. But *Sot:* sayth that *they vse allsoe exposition of Fathers*, therby to attain the meaning of scripture. I marry, & soe doe you, but hovv, and how farr? Sot. lõg as they are not against you, and soe long as in your priuat opinion, they

P. 59. edit. 1. & pag. 130. edit. 2. n. 10.

Hovv lide they giue to fathers.

So sayth Sot. p. 15.

varie not frō scripture. And soe you proue scripture by Fathers, and you iudge of Fathers by scriptures, and soe runne the afore sayd circle: and vvhilest you vvill giue sentence, vvhen the ffathers are consonant and vvhen dissonant to scriptures, you make your selues the fathers iudges: and consequently take not your expositions of scripturs from them, but from your selues, because you allovv not their expositions as proceding from them, but as they are conformable to your ovvne interpretation, & priuate fancies, yea you yeeld no more to Fathers then you yeeld to *Mahomet*, *Turks*, *Iewes* or *heretikes*, for them you beleue when in your opinion they teach conformably to scripture, as in some things they doe. Vvherefore *Luther* bids a deuv to al Fathers, Diuines, Schooles, Councels and Bishops, and the consent of so many ages and Christian people; *nihil recipimus nisi scripturas. Sed sic vo penes nos solos sit authoritas interpretandi: quod nos interpretamur, hoc sensit Spiritus sanctus: quod adferunt alij quamuis magni, quamuis multi, a spiritu Satanæ & alienata mente profectum est.* As for *Sotcliffes* other helpe which he vaunteth of, to wit, *discourses of histories*: that may helpe much in the historicall parte of scripture, but as for the do-

l. de ser. arbi.

ternal parte, it can yeeld little help or none at all. As for example, to the attayning of the true sence of these vvordes, *This is my Bodie: The father is greater then I, The vvord was made flesh: vve thinke a man to be iustified by fayth*: In vvhich there haue been, and still are many and diuers opinions cõcerning their true sense & meaning, vvhat can the knowledg of histories auaile? Matt. 26. Io. 1.14. Rom. 3.

4. Certes Claudius Xaintes reckeneth fovver score and fovver diuers expositions of those fovver vvords *Hoc est corpus meum*, This is my body. but tell me I pray the *Sotel.* dost not thou condemn *Luthers* opinion cõcerning the reall presence of Christs bodie in the Sacrament? And yet he vvill say *that he relyeth on the Spirit of God, that either speaketh plainly or expoundeth him selfe in some other place.* And besides he vvill say that he vseth the *exposition of Fathers* (soe farr as they agree vvith scripture) *the helpe of tongues, the discourse of histories, and all other good meanes.* Yea *Sotel.* confesseth that *Luther proceedeth noe othervvise*, and soe as yet, our *Sotel.* hath sayd noe more for his spirit of God, then Luther or any heretike may say, and consequẽtly by making his spirit iudge of scripture and the meaning of scripture, he openeth Repetit. 1. cap. vii.

ye gapp to all heretikes. Vvhich consequẽce bicause our *Sot.* despaireth euer to answer, he neuer goeth about to answer. But because he braggeth that his spirit is the spirit of God and a publique, not a priuate spirit: I demãd of him, in vvhat publique person he placeth this publique spirit, and he shall as hardly answer my demand, as shevv a publique and visible lavvful iudge in his Church, which he shall neuer shew, as appeareth by the sixt chapter of my first booke. And although I graunt that the spirit of god is noe priuat spirit, yet *Sotcliff* and his reformers, vvhoe haue lefte the Catholike Church, to vvhich this spirit is promised, and vvill not, relie on any Church as on an assured stay, can not proue their spirit to be the spirit of God, but by bare scripture or their priuat spirit, both vvhich, doe set open the gap and gate to all heretiques, as I haue allreadie proued, and expect still, Goodman *Sotc.* answer.

Sotc. spirit not publique.

Io. 14. 16.

## The somme of the fourth Chapter.

THe obstinate heretikes of this time worthilie are accused of parricide, & not vnworthy the punishment decreed against parricides, bicause they are vnnatural children to Christ their father, the Church their mother, and like Chammes do deride and contemne their for-fathers. but in so doing they first crack their ovvn credit, bicause the fathers vvere most of them sainctes, as appeareth by their liues, deathes, miracles, and testimonie of the Christian vvorlde: they vvere the most learned in the Church, as appeareth by their vvritings: they vvere the principal membres of the Church, being doctours and pastours, and vvho bare the greatest svvay and authoritie in the gouuernmẽt of the same: they vvere they that opposed them selues to ancient heretiques and discomfited them: they all could not conspire in an errour of faith, as is proued by scriptur, and reason: they euer vvent vvith the true Church, and she vvith them: and so the reformers reiecting this authoritie, declare them selues to haue no part in the ancient Church, vvho vvil haue no societie vvith the fathers, the most eminent members of the same. Secondly thus they open the gapp to all heretikes, bicause fathers being once reiected, coun-

*cels consisting of fathers, and the Churches definitions pronounced by fathers are reiected, and no other iudge is leste to decide controuersies in religion, but scripture and the priuat spirit, vvhich, as before, doe open the gapp to all heretikes.*

*Sotcliffes answer, and the Refutation.*

1. TO this discourse, and the drifte of this argument, *Sotcliffe* answereth, as he is vvont to do, by a mumming silence, and so, if that rule of the lavv be true, *qui tacet consentire videtur*, he that holdes his peace seemeth to cõsent: it seemeth that he graunteth al. But although he answereth not the drift of my argument, yet he bauleth at my *exordium*, calling it a *pedantical declamation*, and no meruaile, because it proueth him a parricide, and guiltie of the facke and punishment of parricides; and he denyeth boldly, that vvhich I laue proued, without answvering my proofes: and he snatcheth at some sayings of myne, vvhich are farr from the force of the argumẽt. *As for vs* (saith he) *vve reiect not fathers that consent one vvith another and vvith holy scripture.* Behold hovv much he yeldeth to the authoritie of fathers? Certes no more, then he vvill yeeld

de reg. in the in 6.

Sot. yeelds no more to fathers then to Mahomet.

to *Ievves*, Turkes, and *Mahomet* himselfe, and al damned heretikes: for to them also he vvill yeeld, vvhen they *consent vvith holy scripture*, as in many points they do. So that *Sotcliffe* vvill giue no credit to the fathers authoritie, but only vvil beleeue him selfe, bicause hee vvil not credit them, but only vvhen in his opinion they *consent vvith holy scripture*: and so maketh him selfe iudge of the fathers, bicause he vvil pronounce sentence, vvhen they consent with holy scripturs, and when they dissent from them: and he preferreth him selfe before thē al, in iudging them to haue dissented, who thought they had consented vvith holy scripturs. But as once, vvhen that vain fellovv *Varius* auouched that *Æmilius Scaurus*, had for mony, betrayed the Empire, *Æmilius* answered, *Varius* saith I ame a Traitour, *Æmilius Scaurus* denyeth it: and vvhich of vs is to be beleeued? so say I: the fathers haue caught the *real presence*, the *sacrifice of the Masse*, *prayer for the dead* & *to the Saincts*, *Purgatorie*, *Free will* &c. and thought therin to haue consented vvith holy scriptures, (as I shal proue in this my reply herafter) but *Sotcl.* saith they dissented therin from the vvord of God: vvho shal be credited? the ancient, learned

*Be Valer. Max. l. 9. c. 7.*

and holy fathers? or a punie, princox, vpstart, light and vnlearned Minister?

2. Then he addeth, that they reiect not al fathers but only some of them, and not their true bookes, *but only the lustardly writings of Forgers.* And yet haue I alleaged Luthers words in which he saith that hee cares not for a *thousand Austens, Cyprians, Churches* and that hee will not bee iudged by Bishops or Angels, but by his doctrin, wil bee iudge of them. I might haue added how he saith: *by a side al armour with which th'authoritie of Councels and Bishops doth gyrd, wee receiue nothing but scripture: Patrum authoritas suscque deque ferenda, the fathers authoritie is to bee cast vpside downe.* I haue alleaged also *Caluin*, who saith *that the names of Councels, Pastours or Bishops, ought to hinder him from examining their spirits by the rule of the word of God, to see whether they bee of God.* I might haue alleaged how the same *Caluin* saith: *when our aduersaries obiect vnto me that this* (to wit prayer for the dead) *was receiued aboue a thousand and three hundred yeares agone; I answer that those ancients were in this thing destitute both of commaundement of God, and authentical example: to bee breefe carryed away into errour.* I might haue rehearsed these other words of his: *I am*

Leont. Regem Angl.

l. de seruo arbitr.

l. 4. Inst. c. 9 § 12.

Reference to the fathers.

l. 3. Inst. c. 5 § 10. edit. Gallican. 1561. & edit. Latin. an. 1591.

l. 3. Inst. c. 4 § 31.

*lde moued vvith the sentences of the Fathers, vvhich, concerning satisfaction, do euerie vvhere occurre. I see truly some of them, I vvil speake simply, al most al of them vvhose bookes are extãt, vvere deceaued in this point, or spake at least hardly.* And again speaking of the blessed Sacrament he saith, *that the ancient Fathers did vvrest this memorie other vvise then vvas agreable to Christs institution.* In the next chapter of my Suruey I haue also alleaged Zuinglius braning vvords: *They affirm, and vve deny, that the Masse is a Sacrifice. Vvho shal be Iudge of this controuersie? The sole (say I) and the only vvord of God. but by and by thou beginnest to cry, the Fathers, the Fathers, haue thus deliuered vnto vs. But I bring to thee not Fathers nor Mothers, but I require the vvord of God.* Doctour *Humphrey* saith Iewel offered to much vvhen he sayd he vvould be tryed by the ancient Forefathers, *vvho* (saith he) *if they teach contrarie, it litle skilleth.* *Vvhitaker* in his answer to D. *Sanders* is as bold as he: *nec te aliquid demõstrasse existimabimus, si vel Patrum integrum Senatum cõmoueris, nisi quod dicitur, id Dei ipsius, non hominum voce cõprobetur:* neither shal we thinke you to haue demonstrated any thing, although you should stirr vp the vvhole Senat of the Fathers against vs, vnless that

l. 4. Instit. c. 18.

In expos. ar. 64.

Io vin Iuelli.

Ex supra d. præfat. eõt. Vvit.

which is sayd, be proued by Gods own voice not the voice of men. And although these men will seem only to præferr scripture before Fathers, yet in deed they giue to them, selues the præcedence. For seing that the question is, whether they or Fathers haue taught conformably to Scriptur, they condemning the Fathers to haue swerued from the rule of scripture, pronounce sentence against them, and making them selues their Iudges, do præferre them selues before thē.

3. Then he pronounceth bodly that *Luther had no reason in matter of the sacrifice of the Masse to disclaim the Fathers, which al with one voice, as I haue shewed against Bellarmin, make against the carnal sacrifice &c.* I graunt that the Fathers auouch not a carnal sacrifice, bicause Christ is now in body glorious, and in the Sacrament is not giuen vs as flesh from the Shambles: but I auouch that al the Fathers generally do hold a true and real sacrifice of Christs body and bloud in the Masse as appeareth by the Fathers alleaged to this purpose by *Bellarmin, Iodocus Coccius*, and others, and as I shal make it manifest by their allegations, which I will produce in the fourth booke and second chapter. And this, *Luther Zuinglius*, and *Caluin* knew wel, and ther-

Iud. Coccius l. 6 de Euch. c. 4.

sore reiected the Fathers authoritie as vve haue seen, and *Berengarius* at his death recanting his heresie, confessed that it vvas the common consent of Fathers and the multitud of miracles, vvhich draue him to the confession of the real præsence: and *Sotcliff* that saith they needed not in this matter to disclaim the Fathers, makes him self vviser then them, and then his *Reuerend and learned Father Tobie Mathevv most vvorthy Bishop of Durham* (as he calles him) for he sayd that a man could not read fathers & beleeue them vnless he vvil be a Papist; and though *Sotc:* is so bold as to deny that he euer sayd so, yet vve are rather to beleeue that learned, eloquent, and glorious *Martyr, Father Campion* vvho affirmeth him to haue sayd so, then a thousand Souldiour-like *Sotcliffe* that affirm and svvear the contrarie. So that although *Beza* and *Caluin* against the *Anabaptists*, and *Libertins*, & the *Protestaunts* against the *Puritanes*, do produce the authoritie of Fathers, yet vvhen Catholikes presse them vvith allegations of Fathers, they reiect them quite, as vvee haue seen, and as *Sotc:* him selfe also doth, vvho though he vvil seem to reuerence their authoritie, yet vvil not credit them any farther then he seeth

Ex Ioan. Herbenio oratr. de eq. na Dñi. pag. 15. ratione 5. in fine.

they *consent with holy Scriptures*, which is not to credit them for them selues, nor to giue more credit to them, then he will to *Mahomet*, Turks, or Ievves, whom he can not reiect, when they *consent with holy scripture*, as in some things they do.

4. But now let vs note the follie of our Dean: he laboreth to free him selfe from parricide and contempt of Fathers, that so he may auoid the sacke: and yet he saith that *if Calum should cal the men of Trent Hogges & Asses he did them a special fauour*. See this mans impudencie. In that Councel was assembled al the grauitie, authoritie, learning and sanctitie of the Church of Christ, and yet shal a light, ignorant, vitious, peeuish and priuat Minister, yea Souldiour, speake thus contemptibly of them? Then he rayleth a Rome, and at the Church of Rome, calling her the *mother of fornications*, and *whore* described in the Apocalypse: which words notwithstanding are either vnder-stood of the societie of the wicked, or if of Rome, not of Rome as now Christian, but as then she was a pagane and persequuting Citie. And hauing not yet eased his stomake, hee belcheth out his malice against S. Gregorie the Great, in these words, which he learned

pag. 14.

Sot. a parricide.

Apoc. 17.

of his Father Fox: S. *Gregorie the first vvanteth much of the learning of former Fathers, yet is neither he nor his messenger Austin so bad, but that his Successors vvere farre vvorse.* And vvhy al this, but to shevv him selfe an vnnatural particide, vvorthy to be sacked, and to haue a dogge, cocke, viper, Ape, yea & an Asse to accompanie him at his death. In this he followeth the steppes of his Father *Luther*, who brake the ice vnto him, vvhen he once sayd: *Gregorij conciones ne teruncium quidem valent, Diabolus eum in dialogo suo crasse decepit:* Gregories sermõs are not vvorth a farthing, the deuil deceiued him grosly in his Dialogue. But behold the respect vvhich these *Chammes*, and *Saucie Sotcliffe*, and an Englishman, or rather a monster bred in some Cornish Mine, beareth vnto Fathers, vvho speake so contemptible of one of the learnedst and holyest Fathers that euer vvas since the Apostles (and vvho as S. Bede saith) vvhatsoeuer he vvas to others, vvas to vs an Apostle, to vvhom vve ovv no lesse then our conuersion from Paganisme to Christianitie. Here certes I admire the patience of the diuin Maiestie and saynts of heauen, vvho permit so base a fellovv, to open so fovvle and blasphemous a mouth, against so great

For Act. & Mon. pag. 107.

to. 2. Ger. fol. 443. 449.

lib. 2. hist. Angl. c. 1.

Sotc. impaciencie.

a Saint of God, vvithout reuenge from heauen. But seing that they haue patience, let vs also. Only I vvill stopp this fovvle mouth vvith the prayses and commendations, wher vvith the ancient fathers and antiquitie it selfe, haue graced this vvorthie Saint. *Baronius* in his Martyrologe vppon the tvvelfe of march alleageth the prayses, which S. *Isidore* and S. *Ildephonse*, the first, Arch-bishop of *Syuil*, the other of *Toletr*, and both great saintes, do giue him. S. Isidore saith thus of him: *Gregorius Papa, &c.* Gregorie the Pope, Bishop of the Romain and Apostolike Sea, ful of compunction of the feare of God, & most high in humilitie, and indued by the grace of the Holy Ghost vvith such light of knovvledge, as not only any of the present tymes is æqual vnto him, but nether of the tymes past. Saint Ildephonse, giues him this commendation: *Ita enim, &c.* For so Saint Gregorie did shine high in perfection of al merits, as, laying aside comparisons of other vvorthy men, antiquitie hath nothing to shevv like vnto him: seing that in holines he surpassed S. Antonie, in eloquente S. Ciprian, in vvisdom S. Austin. I add to this, that the eight Councel of Toletr, for the moral exposition of scriptur, gi-

S. Gregor. prayses.

Baron. martyr. mar. 12

1. de vir. il lust. c. 27.

1. de vir. il lust. c. 2.

2. c.

ues him place before al the Doctours: And Gregorius Turonensis saith: *thu man, one of the First Senatours, from his youth vvas deuout to God, of his ovvn Possessions he founded six Monasteries in Sicillie, the seuenth he instituted vvith in the vvalles of Rome &c. and he that vvas vvont to vvalk the streets in his silkes and pretious stones, now clothed in thinne and meã attire, is consecrated to the Ministerie of our Lords Aultar.* Then after great commendation of his fasting, watching, and praying, thus he concludeth of him: *Literis Grãmaticis* &c. so was he instructed in Grammar, Logick, and Rethorick, that he vvas thought to be second to none, euen in the Citie. And this he vvas before he vvas Pope. Our countriman S. Bede speaketh honourably of his nobilitie, learning, sanctitie, and bookes vvhich he vvrote, and acknowledgeth gratefully that he vvas the Apostle of the English. And S. *Gregorie* him selfe vvriting to King *Edilberth* honoureth S. *Austen* the monke (vvhom our scurrilous *Sotcliffe* calleth *Gregories Messenger*) vvith these vvordes: *Reuerendissimus frater noster Augustinus episcopus* &c. our most Reuerēd brother Austen the Bishop, Skilfull in the rule of the Monasterie, replenished vvith the Science of holy Scriptur in-

Greg. Tur l.10. hist.

l.2.c.1.hist. Angl.

ex Bed.l.1. c.31. hist. Angl.

devved, God being the autour, vvith good vvorkes.

Sotcs chãme. 5. But let this *Cham* go on in contemning his Father, to inhærit therby his maledictiõ: *Furthermore vve do not beleeue, that so vvise a man as Gregorie the first is reputed, vvould vvrite so foolish bookes as the Dialogues vvhich go vnder his name and are so ful of old vvines tales and fabulous toyes.* And vve do not beleeue this your arrogaunt censure of those bookes, a-

S. Greg. Dialogues defended.

gainst the ancient testimonie of the Eastern & vvestern Church, especially hauing taken you tripping so often. S. *Iulian* vvho after

l. prognost. con.

*Quiricus* succeeded S. *Ildephonse*, alleageth a testimonie out of these Dialogues. The

Conc. Tribur. c. 17.

Councel of Triburie maketh mention of a prodigious translation of the body of one

l. 4. Dial c. 35.

*Valentinus* recounted in these Dialogues. *Hadrian* the Pope in his epistle to *Charles* the Great, diuers tymes alleageth these Dialogues, as also doth *Ionas Aurelianẽsis* vvriting against *Claudius Taurinensis*. *Ioannes Diaconus*, affirmeth that Pope *Zacharie* trãslated these

l. 4. c. 75.

bookes into Greeke, for the vse of the *Grecian* Church. The *Grecians* so esteemed those bookes, that of them, they gaue S. *Gregorie* the surname, *Dialogus*. And after al this shal a Princox Minister, call them in question? or

shal

shal not his calling thē in question, discredit him selfe rather then the bookes? But tel vs maister Deane, vvhat are those tales of these bookes, vvhich seeme to you so incredible, and for vvhich you discredit the bookes? Doth it seem to you impossible, that S. *Benedict* by putting the steale of the hatchet into the vvater, made the iron head that vvas fallen into the vvater ascend to the steale? *Helizeus* did the like. doth it seem incredible that S. *Maurus* at the commaundement of S. *Benedict* rann vppon the vvater as on the dry land and fetched out S. *Placidus*, then a child? S. *Peter* did the like at Christes commaundment. Or seems it to our hard beleeuer, to be but a tale of a tubb, that S. *Benedict* by prayer filled an emptie barrel vvith oyle? *Helizeus* did the like. Or that S. Benedict saw in a vision within the compasse of a litle globe, the vvholle vvorld? The deuil shevved to Christ as man, al the vvorld. But I knovv vvhat it is that disliketh this delicate Carpet-Knight. It is S. Benedicts vvallowing stark naked in briers and nettles to put a vvay the tentation of the flesh. It is S. Benedicts making the sign of the cross, vvhich crosseth his Puritan spirit. but if he mislike that, he incurreth the censures of the nevv

l. 2. dial. c. 3

l. 4. Reg. c. 6.

l. 2. dial. c. 6

l. 2. dial. c. 20.

l. 4. Reg. c. 4.

l. 2. c. 35. Mat. 4.

l. 2. dial. c. 2

l. 2. dial. c. 3

Can. 30. Canons vvhich allovv it *as conformable to the*
l. 2. dial. c. 3. & 36. *primatiue Church*. It is the Monastical life vvhich S. Gregorie prayseth, and the fondation of Monasteries vvhich *Sotcl*: can not
l. 4. dial. c. 39. brooke. It is the fier of Purgatorie auerred
l. 4. dial. c. 55. & 58. by S. Gregorie, that *Sotc.* feareth, though he be neuer like to feele so soft & short a fyer. It is the sacrifice of Masse offered for the dead and mẽtioned and allowed by S. Gregorie, against vvhich our rayling Minister so often bauleth. And for these and such like pointes
Cent. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. of the Catholike faith, *Sotcl.* denieth these bookes, as the Magdeburgians do deny also many other vvorkes of the fathers, bicause they can not othervvise vphold their Religion, which is quite opposit to al ancient fathers and antiquitie, and that by their owne confession, as vvee haue seen by their reiection of Fathers, and standing only to Scri-
chap. 3. 4. pture, vvhose bookes yet they discanon, vvhere they find then not pliable to their doctrine, and expound the rest as they list by their priuat spirit.

6. Then *Sotcliff* stormeth at me for affir-
Mat. 5. 19. 29. Luc. 10. Ioan. 11. Ephes. 4. 1. Tim. 3. ming that the Fathers euen of one age only, can not erre in matters of faith: but he answereth not to my arguments grounded in Scriptur and reason by vvhich I proue it.

only he saith, that I suppose falsely that they reiect al Fathers: vvhich yet I had then, and haue novv more amply proued, that they doe, and must needs do, if they vvill not credit them, but vvhen in their opinion *they consent vvith holy scriptur*: For this is to giue no more credit to their authoritie, then to Iewes, Turks, & heretikes, and so it is quite to reiect their authoritie. Then he saith, I *make the exposition of Fathers to be æqual to the Popes determination, vvhich* (saith he) *nether his holy Father, nor his ovvn consorts vvill graunt.* As though Goodman *Sotel.* the Popes and Councels in their decrees did not ground them selues vppon the beleef of the ancient Churche and Fathers? And as though the Pope vvere not comprehēded amongst Fathers & Pastours of euery age? Thē, saith he, *the definitiōs of Councels vvhich are apparently deduced out of Scripture, and the Fathers authentical expositiōs consonāt to the rule of Faith, might be approued by those vvch haue authoritie in the Church.* Here vve see that he receueth Fathers and Councels, but no othervvise then in his opinion they are consonant to scripture, for vvhich their respect, how much the Fathers are beholdē to them, vve haue already seen. But vvho they are in his Church, vvho (as chap. 3. 4.

he saith) may approue the Fathers & Councels definitions, or disproue them, vve shal see in the sixt chapter, vvhere vve shal proue, that they haue no lavvful iudge in controuersies of Religion in their Church, nor no meanes to compose these controuersies.

The conclusion.

7. Hauing then proued that our new Christians do reiect al ancient Fathers and make no count of their authoritie: I may, notwithstanding our Deanes answer, (vvhich is none at al) Inferr again, my aforsayed conclusions. Vvherof one vvas, that thus they crack their credit very much: For if the Fathers and the true Church, and the Church and Christ euer vvent together, they in reiecting Fathers, separate thē selues from the true Church and from Christ him selfe: according to the saying of Eudoxius in the Councel of Chalcedon: *Omnis qui non consentit expositionibus sanctorum Patrum, seipsum alienat ab omni Sacerdotali cōmunione & à Christi præsentia.* The other conclusion was, that thus they open the gapp to al heretikes: bicause Fathers being reiected, Councels and the Churches definitions, yea and Traditions also, vvhich vvere conserued by Fathers from age to age, are of no authoritie, and so no other Iudge is left but bare Scrip-

ture and the priuat spirit, vvhich, as before, do set the gapp vvide open to al heretikes, vvho may rush in boldly and bluntly, and no man shalbe to vvithstand them.

## The somme of the fift Chapter.

THE 11 Chapter shevveth hovv Christian Religion, though it be aboue reason and so not proueable by reason, ought notvvithstãding to be credibly proposed by credible and probable motiues, else, if we should beleeue vvhere no probabilitie is to moue vs, vve should be light in beleeuing, and might imbrase errour for truth and veritie. And thus Christian faith at first, vvas proposed by Christe and his Apostles, and the first planters of Religion in particuler Countries, as appeareth by the miracles vvhich vvere vvrought for it, the prophecies vvhich fortold it, the inconquerable force of this faith vvhich vvas perswaded by Fishermen, maugre al the Tyrants and Philosophers of the vvorld: to vvhich novv may be added consent of nations, succession, and conformitie to the primatiue Church, and ancient faith and Pastors. Vvherfore if God should permit this faith to fal or to decay, and would send preachers to repair these ruines, he must giue them probable and credible meanes to induce

men to this reformatiō, else they might iustly persist in their old errours, and they should open the gapp to al false Prophets, preach they neuer so incredibly. By reason, the reformers can not demonstrate their Reformation (for by what reason can they proue that faith only iustifieth, that there are but three sacraments, that ther is no Purgatorie, that God is the autour of sinne, that christ is God of him selfe?) By authoritie then they must make it probable and plausible. And authoritie being gotten, ether by learning, or vertue, or antiquitie, or number, or office and dignitie, they are proued to come short of the old Pastours in these pointes. If they say that they alleage Scripture for their Reformation, it is not sufficient, bicause al heretikes haue euer alleaged Scripture, and al the sectes of these new Christians do soe, euen in pointes, in which they square and varie. If they alleage that those heretikes alleaged scripturs in a false sense, they will say so of them, and Catholikes will second them in it: bicause (as wee haue seen) nether Lutheranes nor Caluinists can proue their mission, and so being not able to proue them selues lawfull Pastors, can not proue that they haue authoritie to interpret scriptur, and consequently can not acertain vs of the true meaning no more then other heretikes can. Wherfore sing that the Lutheranes and Caluinists can say no more for their religion then al heretikes can, if wee hav-

*ken to them we must harken to al, because the same proofes require the same credit: but ther are no probable motiues to induce vs to follow vs al heretikes, ergo, nether haue* Lutheranes *nor* Caluinists *any credible motiues, to induce men to be of their religion.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the refutation.*

TO this if *Sotcliff* would haue answered in form, he should haue brought the probable motiues he hath to perswade vs to his religion, which also he should haue proued to be probable and more probable then were those motiues which before held vs in Papistrie, or at least then are those which euery heretike can produce.

For as *Luther* and *Caluin* at the first, found fault with prayer to Saintes, prayer for the dead, Purgatorie, the sacrifice of the Masse, seuen Sacraments, free will, ablenes to fulfil the commaundements, necessitie and merit of good workes, vowes and such like, which we haue receiued from our Forfathers: So can other heretikes also Find fault with other points of religiõ, and cal thẽ corruptiõs and errors which are crept into the Church. And they may put the old Pastours, as tea-

Heretikes improbable motiues.

chets of corruptions out of their places, and intruding them selues, they may preach and alleage Scripturs for their doctrin, vvhich may make some shevv of proofe also, especially if they intetpret them as the list, as Luther and Caluin haue done. And if you obiect that their expositions are contrarie to the ancient Church, Fathers, and Councels expositiō, they may say that they vvill stand neither to Churches, nor Fathers, nor councels arbitrement, no further then (in their opinion) they are consonant to Scriptur. If you aske them vvho gaue them authoritie to preach, who imposed hands vppon them to vvhat Bishops or Pastours they succeed: they may say that in a defection of ordinatie Pastors they need not imposition of handes from an ordinarie Bishop, or else they may make claim vnto an extraordinarie calling, and answer as vvel for their Mission as *Lutherans* and *Caluinists* can doe. If you aske where their Church was before they began to Preach: they can answer that ether it vvas fallen, or vvas inuisible, or vvas an obscure, abiect, and vnknown cōpanie: or they can say that they succeed the anciēt Fathers, in that they taught conformably to scripture, vvhich is as good an Answer as Luthe-

Luth. and Calu. haue noe better motiues.

A boue fol. 40.

ranes or Caluiniſtes can make, as vve haue ſeen in the firſt chapter. And ſeing that *Lu-* fol. 40.
*ther, Caluin* and the *Reformers* of this age, can alleage noe more for their religion, they haue no other meanes to induce vs to their religion, then Anabaptiſts & vvhatſoeuer heretikes may haue, and conſequétly they haue no probable meanes. And to al this our *Sotcliff*, as one that diſpaireth to alleage more probabilitie for his Religion then al heretikes can doe, anſwereth nothing, yea he roucheth not this point, as to hoat for his tēder fingars: only like *Vvill Sommer*, negleeting to haue him ſelf from a brokē pate, he ſtrikes at me and al Papiſts, ſaying, that the *Turke* pag. 16.
*now may better alleage antiquitie, conſent, authoritie of Miſſion, the ſubdevving of the vvorld to their Religion, miracles, and ſuch like motiues then the Papiſts.* But vvhat is this to the probable or credible motiues which are demanded at his hands to induce vs to his Religion? As for the motiues Catholikes haue to induce men to their Religion, *Sotcliff* can not be ignoraunt that many bookes are written of that ſubiect. In Bellarmine he ſhal find fifteen, in *Father Campion ten*, in *Bozius* an. 100. Boz. to. 1.
*motiues*, and in my ſecōd booke he ſhal find & 2. de ſi-
ſome, able to perſwade any reaſonable man. gnis Eccl.

Then he saith that I shal neuer be able to proue the *Popes and Mass-Priests Mission to sacrifice for the quick and the dead* (which yet I
fol. 26. haue already, proued in the first chapter) *and to cut Princes throats, which*, he saith, *be principal points of their Missiō. Thirdly* (saith he) *wee offer to proue, that wee haue not only these probable motiues which he speeketh of, as miracles, consent, antiquitie, and such like, but also the word of God, the testimonie of the ancient Church and many sure grounds, which our aduersaries want.* But, Sir *Sotcliff* now is not the tyme of offring proofes, but of prouing, because not bragges, nor offers, but proofes are demaunded. I haue alleaged what probable meanes and credible proofes you can haue and haue shewed them to be insufficient, and you when you should bring better proofes, make only an *offer to proue*. But if you be so franke in offring, why do you not bring some few at least of more credible motiues, then those are which I haue reie-
a similitud. cted? Our Dean seemes to me, not vnlike the bragging Souldiour, who when his Aduersarie setts vppon him fiercely, ether runneth away, or at least defendeth not him selfe, but offers him the combat, and biddes him meet him in the feeld the next day, that

so for the present he may auoid the combat: For so *Sotcl.* being by me assaulted, and put to his defence, offreth like *Signior Braggadore*, to bring probable and credible motiues farr more pregnaunt then the Papists haue, that so for the present he may be easied of that labour. As for his *miracles*, vve neuer hard as yet of so much as the healing of a lame dogg done by *Luther* or *Caluin*, or any of the greatest pillars amongst them, and *Sotcl.* should haue remẽbred that aboue in the first chapter he saith: *nether do vve practise miracles, or* pag. 8. *stand vppon Prophecies.* As touching his *consent*, vve shal see hovv great it is, in the second booke and sixt chapter, His *Antiquitie* reacheth noe higher, then *Luther* in *Germanie*, *Cranmer* in *Ingland*, *Farel* in *Fraunce*, and *Knox* in *Scottland*, as we haue seen in the first chapter. The letter of the vvord of God they alleage in deed, but not the word of God, as I haue declared in the second chapter, and that, they alleage also, no other vvise, then the deuil did, and al heretikes haue done, and may herafter do, as vvee haue also proued. The *testimonie of the ancient Church*, is quite against them, as partly vvee haue seen by their disclaiming from ancient Fathers, partly, we shal see in the next booke aboue ch. 3. 4.

and fifte chapter. The reſt of his anſvver is nothing but rayling, lying, affirming vvithout prouing, impertinent ſpeaches, but nothing to the matter in queſtion, or the drift or my argument. Amongeſt others, I note one lye vvorthy to be crovvned, vvhich is, that Ievvels falſe allegations are *iuſtified by Maiſter vvitakers*, and that the Lord of *Pleſſy Mornay*, vvhich he calleth *Marli, hath verified his allegatiõs againſt al his accuſers*. For the King of Fraunce and his vvholl Kingdom vvil tel hovv plainly the learned Biſhop of Eureux cõuinced him of falſe dealing in that point, yea his own cõfeſſion in his Excuſe ſet forth ſince his foyle, and the letters of Monſieur d'Eureux in French, ſince tranſlated, by the autour of the three conuerſions, in the end of the third part, and the Relation of the vvholle hiſtorie, is a ſufficient euidence to proue *Sotcliff* a lyer.

A lovvd lye.

## The ſomme of the ſixt chapter.

IN this Chapter I haue ſhevved hovv neceſſarie a viſible head is in al ſocieties, euen vnto villagies and Families, and much more in the Church of God, vvhich therfore, nether in the lavv of Nature, nor

of Moyses, nor of Christ, vvanted a supreme Pastour, as is proued. And although Christ still remain supreme Pastour of his Church, yet he conuersing not nowv visibly amongest vs, another suprem and visible Pastour, vvho is his Vicair, is necessarie to gouern by lawves and decrees, and to decide cõtrouersies. The suprem visible Pastour, after, and vnder Christ, vvas S. Peter, and after him euer vvas and still is the Bishop of Rome, as is proued breefly in the first edition of this booke, and more amply in the second, by Scripturs, Fathers, and practise of the Church. Then I demaund vvhat suprem Iudge and Pastour the Reformers haue of their Church in Ingland and out of Ingland? To say that Christ is their cheef Iudge is not sufficient, bicause euerie heretical Synagogue chalengeth him, and besides, he not conuersing with vs visibly, nor pronouncing any sentence out of scripture, besides him a visible Iudge is necessarie, vvhich also is proued. To alleage scripture or the privat Spirit for this Iudge, is to shew themselues senseles and vvithout al iudgment. To præfer my Lord of Canterburie, or their Clergie, ether of Ingland, or other Countries ioyntly, or seuerally, to this authoritie, is ridiculous: bicause nether do these Clergies aggree in doctrine or gouernment, nether haue vve any warraunt of their authoritie, they being not able to proue their Mission. The Prince and Parlament can not be this

*Iudge, bicause to decide controuersies, and to gouern in the Church, is a spiritual power, and so not be longing to temporal states: yea if they were Iudges, wee should haue as many religions as Princes and Parlaments. Or if any one King or Parlament, as of Ingland, take vppon them this office to decide controuersies in Religion, then, as Religion byndeth al nations, so al nations should be subiect to this Prince or Parlament, to which they wil neuer agree, especially hauing no warrant out of scripture, for their authoritie. Hence I inferr that the Newe Church is not the true Church of Christ, bicause it hath no visible Iudge to decide controuersies and to gouern it: and that in this Church the gap is open to al heretikes, bicause ther is no visible Iudg to keep them out, or to controlle them.*

*Sotcliffes answer, with the refutation.*

TO this if *Sotcliffe* would haue answered like a scholler, he should haue first answered my arguments, which proue one Suprem visible head to be necessarie in the Church of Christ, and that the Pope, after S. Peter, is this Iudge. Then he should haue pointed out his Iudge, who ruleth the rest in his Church, and if by me he bee already reiected, he should haue better established

him and answered my arguments. But he like *Will Sommer*, finding greater facilitie in striking then warding, that is in obiecting then answering; seekes to proue that no suprem visible head is necessarie: that if he fayle in establishing his visible head, it may seem lesse material. He saith therfore that I *absurdly do reason from politike bodyes to Christs Church and mystical body:* and saith that *if I come into my countrie and reason no better, the constable of the Parish if he be a man of any understanding* (as we see by this that *Sotcliff* is) *may do well to set me by the heeles.* Secondly, saith he, *if any argument might be drawn from thence* (that is from politike bodyes, which, euery one, haue their head) *it would ouer throw the Popes monarchie.* And why? *For albeit* (saith he) *euerie Kingdome, Armie, Citie, and village hath his gouernour, yet it were absurd to make one King ouer al the world, one commander ouer al armies, one Grand Maiour or Constable ouer al the Maiours and Constables of the world.* Here I will not cal for the *Constable of the Parish*, as he doth, *to set him by the heeles for reasoning no better:* but I cal for the Keeper of Bedlam to lock him vp in some dark place, till he come to him selfe again. For what man in his right wits, would argue thus: *It is ab-* Sot. mad.

*surd to make one King ouer al Kingdomes, one commaunder ouer al Armies, one Maiour ouer al Cities, one Constable ouer al villagies: therfore it is absurd to make one head ouer al the Church?* Had not this dean so much vvit left, as to see his want of vvitt herin? I argued thus: In euerie Kingdome there is a King, in euerie armie a Generall, in euerie citie a maiour, yea in euerie village, a Constable, and in euerie familie a Goodmā of the howse: *ergo* in the Church it is conuenient ther should be one suprem head and Pastour. he answereth, that if this argument were good, it would ouer throw the Popes monarchie, bicause it were absurd to make one King ouer all Kingdomes and one Maiour ouer all Cities, & one Constable ouer all villagies, and consequently hee would haue it absurd, to haue one Suprem head in the Church. But if he had the vvitte, he might haue seen the difference: bicause many Kingdomes, Armies, Cities, villagies, families, are distinct bodyes, gouerned by distinct lawes and customes, and so require distinct heades in their kind, but the Church is one body mystical, and spirituall common welth, gouerned by the same faith, and animated by the same spirit: and so should be gouerned by one head, bicause many

many heades do not ſo eaſilie conſerue vnitie as one, one head better aggreeing in cõmaunding then many, and ſubiectes eaſilier aggreing in obeyīg one thē many. And although the charge ſeem to great for one man, yet that vvhich eaſeth it, is, that vnder him he hath Biſhops and Paſtours, and he is to gouern al his ſubiects after one faſhiō, and hath the Spirit of God to aſſiſt him, and Chriſts prayer to ſtrengthen him. Io. 14. Luc. 22.

Then he ſaith: *Thirdly neither vvas ther one ſuprem Iudge of matters of Religion, before the lavv, vnder the lavv, or in the tyme of the ghoſpel, as I haue at large proued againſt Bellarmin in my bookes* de Romano Pontifice, *vvhich are to hoat for ſuch a tēder fingred Surueyor to handle.* But I hauing proued that in the lavv of nature, in the lavv of Moyſes, and in the lavv of Chriſt, ther vvas euer one ſuprem head, you ſhould haue anſvvered my arguments, or at leaſt haue brought one hoat argument out of that your hoate booke (vvhich no doubt deſerueth the fier) to haue proued yᵉ cōtrarie. And vvheras I proue that Adame in his tyme, and Melchiſedech in his tyme, were ſuprem heads of the Church and that alſo out of *Theophilus* and *ſainct Chryſoſtome*, you ſhould not haue contented your ſelfe a lye. L. 2. ad An. tolenum. Hom. 34. in 1. Cor.

vvith this bare denial, *Theophilus is belyed, so like vvise is Chrysostome.* Vvheras also I proue by Scriptures & Fathers, that S. Peter after Christe, is his Vicair, & suprem visible head, and the Pope S. Peters Successour in suprem authoritie, you should not haue been so sparing in your answers, as to affirm only that *for one thousand yeares after Christ, this raunging fellovv, shal not proue, that the Bishops of Rome vvere called Christs Vicars, and that the Title of Peters successours is not common to al true Preachers.* But vvhat if I raunge not so farre, but take the testimonie of S. *Bernard* by me cited, vvho aboue fovvre hundred yeares agone, called Pope *Eugenius* y^e *Vicair of Christ,* and by many other Titles, vvhich can agree only to the Suprem visible head vnder Christe, as *great Preest, cheefest Bishop, Prince of Bishops, in primacie Abel, in gouernment Noi, in Patriarch-ship Abraham, in order Melchisedech, in dignitie Aaron, in authoritie Moyses, in iudgement Samuel, in powver Peter, in vnction Christ,* that is Christs Vicair: vvould not the testimonie of so ancient, so learned and so holy a Doctour, serue to confront a punie, vpstart, and vnlearned ministet? Vvould not those his words in the same place, *They* (that is other Bishops) *euery one haue their particu-*

The Popes supremacie proued.

l. 2. de cõsid. ad Eugen. Papam.

The Pope Christs Vicair.

her flockes assigned them, to thee al the flockes are committed, nether art thou only Pastour of the sheep, but also of al the Pastours, thou art one Pastour, be sufficiēt to stopp the gaping mouth of this banling fellovv? But I vvill terch the Popes Supremacie and vicairship higher. *Constantin* the great calleth S. Peter the vicait of Christ, and the Bishop of Rome the Succeſſor of S. Peter, and consequently the vicair of Christ as he vvas. S. Ciprian saith that hereſies proceed from no other cause, *quam quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec vnus in Eccleſia ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus iudex, vice Christi cogitatur, then that the Preist of God is not obeyed, and one Priest & Iudge in place of Christ, is not thought of.* And by scripture, and testimonies of Fathers, I haue ptoued S. *Peter* to bee Christs general Vicair and suprem head of the Church, and the Pope to bee S. Peters Succeſſour in this Primacie, to vvhich *Sotcliff* answvereth not a vvord. I adde here, that S. *Clement*, in his first Epistle to S. *Iames* the brother of our Lord (vvhich S. Anaclet and Alexander do affirm to be his Epistle) affirmeth, that S. *Peter* gaue to him the povver which Christ gaue to *sainct Peter*: but S. *Peter* vvas the cheefe Vicair of Christ as *Constantine* the *Great* affirmeth, and

Cap. Constantinus. d. 96.

Cipr l. 1. ep. 3.

In epist. 1. ad Iacob. in epist.

Io. 21

as I haue proued out of Scripture, *ergo saint Clement* Pope, vvas also the Vicair of Christ.

vide Bel. l. 2. de Rom. Pont. c. 10. Yea the Popes Vicairs by him appointed, do argue him to bee the Vicair of Christ and Pastour ouer al the Church. For as vvhen the King of Ingland appointeth his Vicair or deputie in Ireland, vvee easily perceue that the King of Ingland is cheefe Lord there, so vvhen vvee read that S. *Leo* made *Anastasius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, his vicegerent in the Eastern Church, & that Pope *Celestin* made *Ciril* Bishop of *Alexandria*, his deputie in the Church of Constantinople, and that *Gelasius* Pope made *Acacius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, his vicegerent in *Ægipt*, and *Hormisda* made *Salustius* Bishop of *Sinil*, his vicair in *Bœtica* and *Lusitania*, and S. *Gregorie* made *Vigilius* Bishop of *Arls* his vicair in *Fraunce*: vve may vvel gather, that the Pope had authoritie out of his particuler Bishoprick of Rome ouer al these Countries, and so vvas Christes general Vicair & suprem head, of the Church. This Primacie

l. 2. de Ro. Pont. Bellarmin also proueth by the Popes Titles, by Appellations from al Churches vnto the Romain Bishop, & by the authoritie which he hath exercised vppon other Bishops (as Victor excommunicated al the Bishops of

*Asia*, vvhich fact though *Ireneus* and others condemned as indiscret: Yet none counted it done without authoritie) which do plainly demõstrate his Supremacie ouer al Churches.

Lastly (vvhich yet should haue been done first) our *Sotcliff* vouchsafeth, but noe more vvillingly then a bear goes to the stake, to name his suprem Iudge in his Church. *Finally* (saith he) *he vvrongeth vs vvhere he saith vve haue no Iudge of matters of Religion. For the only suprem Iudge that determineth infallibly, is God speaking in scriptur.* But seing that Scripture, and God speaking in Scripture, is al one, I hauing proued, both in this chapter, and also in the second chapter, that scripture is no sufficient iudge in respect of vs, to vvhom the true meaning is not knovvn, haue also proued, that God speaking in scripture, is noe sufficiẽt iudge in respect of vs, he speaking in scripture so obscurely, that we nether ate sure vvhich is scriptur, nor vvhat is the meaning of scriptur. As for example: Luther saith that Christs body is really in the B. Sacrament, but vvith the substaunce of bread; and that Carolstadius should haue done him a pleasure if he could haue persuaded him the contrarie, but, saith he, the

Sotcliffes suprem iudge reiected.

ep. ad Argentinenses. & cõt. artic. Iouan.

l. 4. inst. c. 17. words *this is my body*, did conuince me. *Caluin* saith that Christes body and the bread are as distant as heauen and earth, and therfore that Christs body is not really, but figuratiuely in the Sacrament. The Catholikes auouche that Christs body is really in the B. Sacrament, by transubstantiation of the bread into Christs body, and that therfore the bread is not there: yea, say they, Christ had not sayd truly *this is my body*, if any other substance had been there but his body. And al these alleage scripture, and as they think God speaking in scripture. Vvho novv shal be iudge? scripture? she explicates not her selfe. Another iudge then is requisit, to take vp the matter betvvixt them. Likevvise Luther saith the Epistle of S. Iames is not scripture, Caluin saith it is. who shalbe iudge? scripture? She giues no testimonie of her self, and if she did, as vvee may doubt vvhether this or other bookes bee scripture, so vve might doubt, vvhether this testimonie bee scriptur. Vvee must repair then to another iudge, and vvho is that? *Sotcliff* answereth *that if any varietie be about this iudges determination, the suprem iudge of al vppon earth, is a general Councel proceding according to Gods vvord.* Necessitie driues *Sotcliff.* to na-

Mat. 26.

Luth. in præfat. in nouum testa. & l. Capt. Bab. c. de Extr. vnct. Cal. in argumento ep. Iac.

*Sot. Councel reiected.*

me this iudge, for other vvise they make no great account of a general councel. Vvhat more authẽtical and lavvfull Councel then the Councel of the Apostles and Seniours, holden at Hierusalem? *Luther* saith that euen that Councel is not necessarilie to be obeyed: other vvise wee must abstein from bloud-puddings, bicause bloud vvas in that Coũcel forbidden to bee eaten. Vvhat Councel can our Ministers gather comparable to the Councel of *Nice*? and yet *Luther* calles the articles of that Councel *hay, stravve, vvood, stubble*: he condemneth also that canon, in vvhich was decreed, that they vvho guelded themselues, should not be admitted to orders, and yet commaundeth that they vvho are in holy orders should haue no vviues or not vse then if they maried them before orders: as though thet vvere no mean betvvixt vviuing and guelding. Yea the same Luther attributes more to the Catechisme of Children then to a general Councel. and auoucheth that if *the decrees of al the Councels could be prouved by a pipe into thy body, yet thou shouldst not be a Christian*. Yea the same Luther saith that, *neque Papæ neque concilijs neque vlli hominum commissum est vt concludat quid sit fides*: nether to the

Luth. l. b. de concilijs.

Luth. ibidem.

ibidem.

Ar. 15. ex 50. artic.

Pope, not to the Councels, not to any man is it committed to conclude vvhat is faith: so that this iudge is not sufficient. And *Calum* saith that Councels Bishops and Pastours are not of such authoritie, but that they may bee examined, as hee hath dealt vvith the Councel of *Trent* in his *Antidotus*, and *Kemnitius* also in his *Examen. Sotcliff* peraduenture vvill say, that hee is not of their opinion, and therfore vvill stand to a general Councels determination. But hovv he can thus do, I knovv not, he auouching, that it is absurd that faith should depend of men. besids he saith that he beleeues not *preachers*, and consequently not Councels (vvhich consisteth of Bishops and Pastors vvho are preachers) *no farther then they continevv in the doctrine of the Apostles*: and in this place he saith the suprem iudge in earth is a general Councel *proceeding according to Gods vvord*: So that they credit a general Councel no more then they must credit one man, for him they must credit, vvhen he proceedeth according to scriptur. And vvho shal determin, when the general Councel proceedeth according to Gods vvord? not the vvord of God it selfe, bicause that not explicating it selfe, can not determin, vvhen the Coun-

1. 4. inst. c. 9 §. 8. & 12.

pag. 1. lin. 15. & pag. 9. lin. 1. 2.

cel proceedeth according vnto it: not the Councel it selfe, bicause as other definitions of this Councel may be examined vvhether they are according to Gods vvord, so euen this definition of the Councel, may be sifted. not another general Councel: bicause as that general Councel suffereth examination, so euen this that determineth whether the former Councel proceeded according to scriptur, may be also examined. Vvho then shal be iudge? certes I see none but *Luther* in particuler, *Caluin* in particuler, *Zuinglius* in particuler, vvho yet condemned one anothers vvritings as not proceeding according to scripture, and so another iudge must determin, vvhether they consent vvith scriptur, and so *in infinitum*. And here I can not but note in vvhat a Circle our milhorse *Sot*: doth runn. for vvhen he findeth *any varietie about determination of scriptur or God speaking in scriptur*, he saith the Councel must iudge: and vvhether the Councel proceedeth according to scriptur or no, scripture, at least ioyned with the priuat spirit must iudge, and so he enters a circle out of which he shal neuer get forth. for still hee must proue scripture by the Councel, & the Councel by scriptur. But be it that their pag. 10. lin. 5.

General Councel were this Iudge, yet seing that in this newe Church, ther vvas neuer yet seen any General Councel, they are as yet vvithout a Iudge to decide controuersies in Religion, and so as yet are not sure vvhether their doctrine *be consonant to scripture or God speaking in scripture. Sot:* answereth *that in the mean tyme euery nation is to stand to the definition of a National Councel, and to this Iudge must submit them selues.* And thus he thinkes to haue answered very vvisely, and yet answeres not any argument by vvhich I haue reiected this his Councel. But seing that his General Councel *is the suprem Iudge of al the Church vppon earth:* the *National Councel*, is to be directed by it, and so as yet they haue no assuraunce of their doctrin, bicause they haue not yet hard vvhat sentence the General Councel shal pronounce of their national Conncels resolution: yea they shal neuer be acertained of their doctrine, bicause a general Councel can not be gathered amongest them, they hauing none to call it. and if they should meet by chaunce as crovves do in the pease feeld, they could neuer aggree, bicause their Church consisteth of diuers sectes, and hath none to moderate in the Councel, vvhich is the cause,

Sotc. National councel reiected.

vvhy al their conuenticles, hether to haue ended in thundring excommunications, as I haue ſhevved: and for the ſame cauſe the Greeke Church, ſince her reuolt from the cheef Paſtour the Biſhop of Rome (vvhoſe office euer vvas to call Councels and to moderate by his Legates and confirm them by his authoritie) for theſe 800. yeares hath not had one General Councel, vvheras the Latin Church hath hadtē. And ſo this your ſuprem Iudge which you cal a oeneral Coūcel is nothing at al ether *in re* or *in ſpe*, but a mere *Chimera*, and *Platonical Idea*, or pœtical fiction, or a manin the moone. But vvhere vvee can get no ſufficient anſwer, let vs take vvhat vve can: ether you vvil ſtand to the determinatiō of your national Councel, for the authoritie of the Councel, or bicauſe it is cōformable to ſcripture. If for the ſecond, thē another Iudge is yet to be found out to Iudge when the National Councel proceedeth according to ſcripture, and who I pray you is that? If for the firſt: thē ether your National Councel is to be obeyed bicauſe it is the Councel of the nation of Ingland, or bicauſe it is a Councel of a nation in general, or bicauſe it conſpireth vvith other nations. Not for the firſt, for then al countries muſt

ſtand to the arbitrement of the Councel of Ingland: vvhich the Caluiniſts in *Scotland*, *Geneua* and *Switzerland*, will neuer doe, much leſſe vvill the *Lutherans*, as we ſhal ſee in the next booke. Not for the ſecond, for then
Chap. 6. euerie Clergie of a nation ſhould be Iudge, though they Iudge contraries, as the nevv Clergie of Ingland, and Scotland, and Germanie doe, and ſeing that lavvfull Iudges muſt bee obeyed, vve ſhould haue as many Religions, at national Councels are diuers. Not for the third cauſe, for as yet theſe diuerſe Clergies of diuers nations, are at daggers dravving about matters of Religion, as vvee ſhal ſee in the next booke, and they haue no meanes to take vp the matter betvvixt them for vvant of a head and Iudge. Laſtly take your General or National Councel as you vvill, it can not be lavvfull, bicauſe
Sopra. Cap. 1. it can not conſiſt of lavvfull Biſhops and Paſtours, for none of them al cã proue their Miſſion, as vve haue demonſtrated, and as yet you neuer aggreed in a national Councel, for the Puritans haue alvvayes oppoſed them ſelues againſt your national Councels, & yet can ſay as much to proue them ſelues lavvfull Miniſters as you can, and the Catholike Biſhops, and Prieſts, vvho can ſay

more for their authoritie, then ether Protestaunts or Puritans can, bicause they succeed to the ancient Clergie of England, and can proue their Mission, haue alvvayes disclaimed. And so *Sotcliff* hath not yet named any lavvfull and sufficient Iudge in matters of faith: and so is vvithout a Iudge. These argumēts I had brought before against *Sotcliffes* Iudge, but bicause he vvould not see them, but stil proposeth his Councel by thē reiected, I haue proposed them again.

And novv, me thinks, by this coursing of our *Sotcliff*, I haue, cast him into a svveat, and by his svveating, I gather that he smels of a Puritan, and so is a Turncoat, for of late he vvas a Protestaunt to dispose him selfe for a Bishoprick. This my surmise, I fortifie thus: If the King be Suprem head of the Church of Ingland, as the protestants say he is, he is Suprem pastour of the sayd Church, for head and Pastour is al one: but to the pastour, it not only appertaineth that he gouern but also that he feed his sheep: *ergo* the Prince is not only to rule and gouern the Church by lavves and decision of Ecclesiastical causes, but also is to feed it by administration of Sacraments, and interpretation of the vvord of God, by *vvhich the soule* Mat. 4.

Sotc. a princitan.

lineth: and so he is to iudge vvhen the National Coũcel proceedeth according to Gods vvord, and consequently is aboue *Sotcliffes* Councel. and according to this, it vvas decreed by act of parlament, in the first yeare of the raign of Queen *Elizabeth*, that she should haue al povver for the *correction and Reformation of the clergie, for the iudgment and punishment of schismes and heresies, for nomination of Bishops, and for calling of Synods, or national Councels*, and that in such ample manner, as nothing should be decreed in any Councel vvithin the Realm, *vvithout expresse licence and cõsent of the Prince.* Vvherfore seing that our Dean, giueth this authoritie vnto a national Councel, he takes it from the King, and so like a puritan denyes the Kings Supremacie ouer the Church, and denying it, falles into a *premunire*. Yet in so doing, it can not be denyed, but that he shewes him self a true Caluinist: for *Calum* so stormed at the Supremacie vvhich *King Henrie* the eight chalenged, and first of al Christian Kings chalenged, that he brake forth into these vvords: *qui in initio tantoperè extulerunt Henricum Regem Angliæ, certè fuerunt inconsiderati homines: dederunt illi summam authoritatem: & hoc me semper grauiter vulnera-*

Sand. l. de schism. fol. 149. 150. 151.

Sot. incurres a præmunire.

Calu. in c. 7. Amos.

*uit: erant enim blasphemi, cum vocarent eum summum caput Ecclesiæ sub Christo:* They who in the beginning did so much extoll Henrie King of Ingland, were truly incõsiderat men: they gaue him higheſt authoritie: and this did alwayes greeuouſly vex me: for they vvere blaſphemous, vvhen they called him cheefeſt head of the Church, vnder Chriſte. But ſeing that I haue proued that the Prince is not Iudge in matters of faith, and in the interpretation of Scriptur, it followeth that in Ingland, and in al the nevv Church ther is no Iudge to determin matters of faith and to compoſe the controuerſies vvhich dayly ariſe: and ſo my concluſion followeth, to vvit, that this new Church is not the church of Chriſt, bicauſe it wants a viſible, head, and it openeth the gap to al heretikes, vvho in their Church may preach what they vvil bicauſe ther is no viſible Iudge to confront or controll them. And to this I expect, and as I fear, muſt ſtill attend, our Deanes anſwer.

The King no Iudge of faith.

No ſpiritual Iudge in Inglād.

*The Somme of the Seuenth chapter, which is only to be found in the second edition.*

THis Chapter teacheth that al actions are for some end, & that else no action would be vndertakē, or else should in vayn be vndertaken: then it shevveth that ther is noe certayn stay of beleeuing in the nevv Church; bicause the rule & square of faith in that Church, is Scripture sensed by the priuat spirit, vvhich being mutable and vncertain, a man can neuer be settled in religion, but shal alvvayes bee seeking, and yet euer to seeke.

To this argument *Sotcl.* hath giuen no answver, bicause peraduenture, he had not seen the second edition: and therfore I can not make any reply.

# AN ANSVVER TO SOTcliffes Appendix or Addition in vvhich he Surueyeth the grounds of the Catholike Religion.

SOTCLIFFE. Chap. 2.

*THe fondations of Popiſh Religion diſcouered to be moſt vveake and fooliſh.*

KELLISON.

1. I Hauing proued the nevv Church and Religion to be grounded on no other ſtay, and fondations, then ſuch as al heretikes haue herto fore relyed on, and may hereafter build on: our Miniſter endeuoureth to imitate my example, and to ſhevv in his ſecond and third Chapter, that the groundes of the Catholike Religion, vvhich he calleth *Popiſhe*, are no leſſe ſandye and vncertayne but moſt *vveake and fooliſh*. And before he beginneth, he vaunteth that I haue miſtakē the groundes of his religion, and haue had litle to ſay againſt them. But hovv vain this bragg is, the defence of the Title of the firſt booke, and of the booke it ſelfe ſhal vvitneſſe.

2. The *firſt ground* on vvhich he ſaith I build *Popiſh Religion*, is *Miſſion*, againſt vvhich he rayleth

Mission. much, because he knowes he cannot proue his owne preachers Mission: but that which he bringeth against this fondation and the Popes mission, is but a repetition of his fooleries vttered in his answer to my first chapter, which is already answered.

3. His *second ground* of our Religion, which he Scriptur. setteth downe, is *Scriptur*, and yet he saith that *Relisson excludeth scriptures from being a fondation*, which twoe thinges, how they stand together, *videris ipse*. But how I and al Catholikes do make scriptur a principal foundation of Religion, I haue Fol. 5. pa. 1 told him in my second chapter, and in my reply to his answer. For wee do al hold that the principal foundation and formal obiect of Christian faith is the diuine *veritie reuealing*, called *prima veritas*, on which this faith so relyeth, that of it, it is called *fides diuina*, a diuine, not an humain faith. but because, what this diuine veritie hath reuealed in scriptur, is as obscurely reuealed, as scriptur is obscure: therfore we say that in respect of vs the authoritie of the Church and her Pastours, is necessarie to interpret this obscure letter, and the authoritie of our Church, we proue, by Succession and by her markes, which are *One, Holy, Catholike*, and *Apostolike*, which I haue demonstrated in the second booke to agree to our Church only, and not to *Sotcliffes* Synagogue. And so our fondation, which is *Scripture* interpreted by the Church, is surer then *Sotcliffes* Fondation, which is *Scriptur* interpreted by euerie ones priuat spirit (of which nether he nor we haue any assurance in scriptur

Catholikes Fondation more sure then heerenkes fondatiō.

or out of ſcriptur), or elſe by his national Councel, vvhich conſiſteth of Paſtours that can not proue their Miſſion, and vvhich is to be credited no more then a Turk or Ievv, bicauſe no farther them in their priuat opinions, it conſenteth vvith Scripture.

4. The third fondation vvhich he ſaith, I do alleage, is *Councels* and *Fathers*. But he ſaith, I do not name vvhat the Councels and Fathers are, nor vvl... are the vvritings of theſe Fathers. As though euery man vvhen he ſpeaketh of Councels and Fathers, doth not vnderſtand al the Fathers generally, and the Councels vvhich by the Chriſtian vvorld are holden for lavvfull, and the vvritings vvhich carie, and allvvayes haue caryed the names of the Fathers, of vvhich alſo vvee are as aſſured, as *Sotcliff* can be of any ancient vvritings: and al theſe I haue ſhevved to bee for vs & againſt them by their ovvn confeſſions and exclamations, yea railings againſt them. And bicauſe *Sotcliff* ſaith that the Fathers are corrupted by vs to maintein our religion againſt theirs, let him take ether the bookes of Fathers vvritten before his religion vvas hatched, or the bookes ſet forth by his ovvne conſortes at Baſil, and other places, and vvee vvill conuince him as vvee haue already conuinced others, euen out of thoſe vvritings. Then *Sotc:* ſeekes to impugne the authoritie of Councels and Fathers and to proue that they may erre, vvherin he fighteth againſt him ſelfe: bicauſe if the ancient Fathers and Councels vvith common conſent could erre in interpretation of Scriptur, thē much more

Councels and Fathers.

See chap. 3. 4. 5.

may his diuided and mutinous Synagogue, and especially his *National Counsel*, vvhich he maketh *Suprem Iudge till a General Counsel be called*, and so he hath therby but a vveake fondation to lean on.

Sup. fol. 75

But I haue proued that our Church and suprem Pastour, yea and our Fathers iointly taken, and Councels confirmed by the Suprem Pastour, can not erre in deliuering matters of faith vnto vs.

Mat. 10. 16
Act. 15.
Mat. vlt.
1. Tim. 3.
Luc. 10.
Heb. 3.

Vvherfore *Athanasius* vvondereth hovv any dare cal in question the decrees of the *Nicen Counsel*, and *S. Augustin* calleth the definition of the Romain Counsel called by *Melchiades* the Pope, the last sentence, from vvhich is no appeal, and of vvhich, he sayth Constantin the Emperour durst not pronounce sentence; and *S. Gregorie Nazianzen*, and *S. Leo*, hold them infallibly for heretikes, vvho vvil not yeeld to a General Counsel. And in the Counsel of *Epheſus* and the fist Synod of *Constantinople*, the common consent of Fathers vvas followed as a rule of faith. And if al these could erre: yet is ther more credit to be giuen to them, then to *Sotc.* punie and vnlerned and mutinous ministers, vvho can not proue them selues lavvfull Pastors and preachers. Vvheras *Sotc.* alleageth *S. Hierom* and *S. Augustin* to disproue the Fathers authoritie, they only affirm that the Fathers vvritings are not holy scriptur, nor of that authoritie: bicause though the common consent of Fathers be infallible, yet as I haue declared in my 2. cood chapter, the holy Ghost assisted the vvriters of Scriptur; not only for the sense and truth, as he doth Councels and Fathers iointly conspiring, but also for euerie vvord: they

Ep. ad Epict. & apud Epiphan. her. 76.
Aug. ep. 162.
Ep. 1. ad Chelid.
Leo ep 77
78. Basil ep. 28.
Con Eph. ex Vinc. Lyrin. c. 42. Constantinop. 6. act. 11.

affirm also that some one or some fevv Fathers may erre, as did S. *Ciprian* in the matter of rebaptizing, but they say not that al Fathers iointly, can erre in matters of faith.

5. *The last* (saith he) *and most authentical Fondation is the Suprem Iudgemēt of the Pope.* Thus he: but otherwise vvee. For vve say that the *Prime veritie*, and vvord of God is a more Principal Fondation, yet bicause scripture and the meaning of Scripture, be not so knovvn to vs, as is the Church, or her suprem Pastour, vvee ioyn to Scripture the authoritie of the Church, or her Suprem Pastour, as an Interpretour, vvithout the vvhich, the letter of Scripture, may as vvel be a fondation of heresies as true faith and Religion. Vvheras *Sotus* saith that this is to make faith to depend on men, I graunt it in respect of vs, and haue also proued it in my defence of the Title of the first booke of my *Survey*. And to this I vvill bring *Sotus* him selfe, for he grauteth, as vve haue seen in the former chapter, that vvhen any varietie is about the determination of Scripture meaning, *the Suprem Iudg in earth is a General Councel*, and in default of that, *every nation is to stād to a National Councel*, & so in his opiniō also, faith depends of men. But if bicause vvee say that faith in respect of vs dependeth of Preachers, and especially the cheefe Pastour, he vvill infer, that *this sheweth that Popish Religion is rather from man then God, and that ther is no certaintie in Popish Religion:* I deny that consequence, bicause our Religion dependeth on Gods vvord principally, yet on men also in respect of vs, as is declared: and if the con-

The Popes iudgment.

pag. 10.

sequence were good, it would conclude as wel against *Sotcliff* as vs: for hee graunteth that Religion in respect of vs dependeth of a General or National Councel of men. Yea the consequence in deed, is good against him, but not against vs. Because wee can proue our Church to bee the true Church, by succession and other markes, and consequently to haue the *Spirit which teacheth al verities*: and so in this respect also, our Religion stands on a sure ground, to wit on the true Church that can not erre, as aboue is proued: but *Sotcliff* can not proue his Church to bee either *one, Catholike, Holy, or Apostolike*, as wee shal see in the next booke, but rather must confesse it to haue al the marks of an hereticall synagogue, as wee shal proue in the same place: wee can cal a lawfull Generall Councel, consisting of lawfull Pastours, in the midst of which Christ hath promised to bee: *Sotcliff*, as as we haue seen in the former Chapter, can not: we can name our Suprem Pastour, and proue him lawfull by prouing his missiō, and wee can proue that hee being S. Peters successour, can not deliuer vs heresie for true doctrine, as aboue we haue declared; which our *Sotc.* can not. So that the Fōdation of our faith is more sure thē that of *Sotc.* for wee ground our faith on scripture interpreted by the church, whose authoritie is sure & infallible hauing the infallible assistance of Gods spirit, *Sotc.* & his consorts, do ground their faith on Scripture interpreted by their priuat Spirit, or by thē which can not proue thē selues lawful Pastours, which hath alwayes been the Fondation and ground-

Io. 14.

vvorke of al hereſies, as is declared in the ſecond chapter. After this our rolling ſtone runneth to D. *Stapletons Principles of Faith*, and *Melchior Canus* his *common places*, againſt vvhich he rayleth, but bringeth nothing of vvorth or vvaite.

6. *Likevviſe Stapleton* (ſaith *Sot:*) *handling of purpoſe this argument in the preface of his booke of doctrinal principles, delivereth vnto vs ſeuen principles and Fondations of Faith: firſt the Catholike and Apoſtolike Church*, &c. Againſt theſe principles *Sotcliff* alleageth ſuch friuolous reaſons, that it vvould make a man caſt his ſtomake to hear them: and therfore I omit them: only I note the ſecond and third. *Secondly if the rude fellovv had but had one grain of pietie he vvould not haue left out the holy Scripturs out of the number of Chriſtian Principles.* Mark hovv modeſtlie he ſpeaketh againſt one of the Learneſt men of this our age. But this dogge Knevv, that a dead lion bites not, othervviſe if he had been liuing, he vvould haue ſhaken an hundred ſuch brickle Miniſters as *Sotcliffe* is, al in peeces, as he did in his life tyme *Hern, Fulk, Vvhitaker*, and others: and theſe his principles he hath handled ſo learnedly, that *Sotcliff* may as ſoone remoue Mauborn Hilles, as ſturre one of them: and yet he calleth them not al Principles of faith, but only in reſpect of vs. But *Sot:* ſaith, that D. *Stapleton* left out ſcriptur. And I anſvver that *Sotcliff* ſhould haue left out this lye for ſhame. For in the *Fift Principle* he handleth the canon of Scriptur, and confeſſeth in the very beginning, that though vve can not Knovv Scripturs but by the Church, yet they haue not their veritie

Stapleton defended.

Contron. 3. l. 9.

of the Church, no nor their authoritie, but only in respect of vs. And in his *Sixt Principle* he handleth the interpretation of Scriptur, and proues it to appertain to the Church and her Pastours.

Contro. 6. l. 10.

Vvheras *Sotcliff* saith that the Church (vvhich is one of *Stapletons* Principles) is not the Fondation of the Church but is built vppon a fondation, he might haue kept that in his purse: for *Stapleton* treateth of Principles of Faith, and so makes not the Church a fondation of the Church but of Faith, & confesseth in a thousand places, that the Church is built vppon Peter and his successours, as on a rocke and fondation, but yet so, that Christ is the Principal Fondation, on vvhich Peter him selfe relyeth.

6. From *Stapleton* he runnes to *Canus*, snarling at him in this manner: *Canus* in his booke *de locis Theologicis* layeth down ten grounds, *from vvhence al arguments in controuersies in Diuinitie, in his opinion are deriued: The first is holy Scriptur, the 2. Tradition, the 3. is the authoritie of the Catholike Church*, &c. But *Canus* calles not these *grounds*, as *Sotcliff* doth, but only *Places*, out of vvhich diuines do drawv arguments for proofe of our Religion. Yet the first Sixe may bee called grounds & Fondations in respect of vs, bicause by them vve are acertained of scripture and interpretation of scriptur, and the others are not so certayne, and therfore though from their authoritie, probable arguments may be deduced, yea and frō the seuenth place so probable, that as Canus saith, to contradict al the Schoole men vvere rashly done, yet are they no groūds. In *Canus* his

Canus defended.

grounds also, *Sotel.* hath noted, first, that the Pope is vrging, vvhō *Stapleto*, had layed for a fondatiō: but if he take his spectacles, and read the sixt booke of these places, he shal find that in establishing the fift place, vvhich is the Authoritie of the Church of Rome, he disputeth much about the Popes authoritie, & proueth it to bee infallible. Then he obserueth that if *Canus* his places be grounds of Religiō, faith shal depēd on men, and shalbe as mutable as mē. But to this I haue diuers tymes answered, that Faith dependeth of the Church and Pastours only in respect of vs, and yet is not mutable, bicause the Church and Pastours, and Fathers taken all ioyntly, and the Pope defining *ex cathedra*, haue the infallible assistaunce of Gods spirit, as *Stapleton*, and *Canus* in the places alleaged do demonstrate at large, and as I also haue breifly proued.

7. Then he takes his fligt to the *Phœnix*, of this age for cōtrouersies, Bellarmin: *Bellarmin* (saith he) *in his Preface lib. de Rom. Pont. is not ashamed to apply these vvords of the Prophet Isay. Behold I vvill put a stone in the Fondation of Sion, vnto the Pope. there also he auoucheth the Sea of Rome to be the Fōdation of the Faith.* Here vve see, that as the spider gathereth poison out of the best and swéetest hearbs, not that in them vvas poison, but that he turneth the moystur sucked frō them, into poison: Soe *Sotcliffe* euilly interpreteth Bellarmines Preface (in vvhich he most learnedly, and perspicuously explicateth that place of *Isai*, and applieth it most aptly) not that in the Preface is euil, but that *Sotcl. Poisonful* mallice, turneth it to euil. For *Bellarmin* proueth that *S. Peter* and his suc- Bellarmin defended.

cessours are the rock and fondation, on vvhich
Mat. 16. Christ promised to build his Church, & although (saith he) al the Apostles are called fondations, yet amongest them, saith he, Peter is a singuler fondation and pretiouse: a fondation, bicause notvvithstanding so many persequutions, schismes and heresies, vvhich haue battred this fondation, it still remayneth firme and stable, according as Christ promised saying *the gates of hel shal not preuail against that rock*: and a *pretious fondation*, as from vvhich as from a Fontain, so many protections of afflicted Bishops, so many conuersions of countries haue proceeded, and by vvhich so many heresies haue been condemned, so many Schismes composed, such peace & vnitie established: but yet (saith he) Peter and his succesſours, and their *See*, is a fondation placed vppon a fondation, bicause the Principal and only Principal Fōdation is Christ, vppon vvhich Peter and his succesſours are couched. And to this purpose he alleageth that place of Isai: *I vvil put a stone in the fondation of Sion, an approued stone, a corner stone, a pretious stone, founded in the Fondation.* Novv if *Sotcliff* meruail, that Bellarmine *vvas not ashamed* to apply this to S. Peter and his Succesſours, hee must vvonder also, vvhy Christ blushed not to cal
Ephes. 2. Apoc. 21. Peter *the rocke of his Church*: vvhy S. Paule and S. Ihon shamed not to cal al the Apostles *Fundamenta*, Fondations: vvhy S. Hierom doubted not to
Hieron. in Isa. 2. apply that of the second Chapter of Esay: *then shalbe a mountain prepared in the topp of mountains*, vnto S. Peter, saying: *vppon one of the mountains Christ doth found his Church and speaketh to it: Thou art Peter,*

*and vppon this rocke vvill I build my Church*: Vvhy S. Hilarie feared not to exclame, *O in nuncupatione no-* In c. 16.
*minis felix Ecclesia fundamentum*: *ô beatum cœli ia-* Mat.
*nitor*. Certes as Christ is the only true God, light, and principal rocke, and yet by participation, his Mat. 5. 16.
Apostles and Seruaunts may be called, *Gods, light of the vvorld, and rockes*, so is he the only Principal Fondation and head of the Church, and yet may *Peter* and his Successors, be called vnder-heads and fondations. Then *Sotcliff* roueth as his manner is from one thing to another, and al to shevv on vvhat a firm fondation their faith is built, on hovv vveake a ground Catholiques religion is builded, bicause they rely on Scripturs, Catholikes on mennes decrees and definitions. But to this, hee is already answvered. Vvherfore novv as he concludeth, *Open your eyes therfore deare Christians and suffer not your selues to be abused by the Impostures of Masse-priests*, &c. so do I turn the tale against him thus: open your eyes deare countrimen, and suffer not your selues to be abused by the Impostors of Ministers. You see they can not distinguish them selues from false Prophets, bicause they can not proue their Mission, you see they are not resolued in the fondations of Faith, bicause though al of them alleage scriptur, yet vvhat bookes of Scriptur one admitteth, another reiecteth, and they are not yet assured vvhich of their English, or French bibles are authentical: and therfore in the conference at Hampton Court, your English Bible vvas censured as *il translated*, and some of your Bi- pag. 45.
bles, as conteining *very partial, vntrue, and seditious* 46. 47.

notes, and to much sauouring of dangerous and traiterous conceipts: and therfore order vvas taken to make a nevv translation: you see their communion booke and seruice, and Ecclesiastical disciplin, vvas condemned by moe then a thousand ministers: and the Puritanes cal the gouernment of the Church of Ingland *Antichristian, deuilish, little better then that of the Samaritanes, traiterous against the maiestie of Iesus Christe, a false, vnlavvfull, and bastardly gouernmēt*: and in their admonition, they condemne your vocation and ordination of your ministers and administration of Sacraments, The dignities of your Clergie, and gouernment of your Church: You see neither Protestaunts nor Puritans, haue other grounds and fondatiōs of their faith, then *Anabaptists* and al heretikes haue, vvhich is the letter of scripture sensed as it pleaseth euery ones spirit, vvhich hath been the fondation of all heresies: you see they haue no probable meanes nor motiues to induce you to their religion, nor no visible Iudge to compose controuersies (al vvhich I haue proued) and you shal see hovv their Synagogue hath al the markes of heretikes, and hath no preest hood, nor sacrifice, hovv their doctrine, is iniurious to Christe, to God, to Princes, to good life and pietie: and yet vvill you permit your selues to be abused by them? but novv let vs see his third Chapter, vvhich he entitleth Kellisons motiues to Popish Religion.

Petition exhibited in April. 1603.

Dāgerous positions l. 2. c. 4.

Admō. to the Parl.

*Kellisons motiues to Popish Religion compared with the motiues that may induce men to embrace true Christian Religion: Their in also the true motiues to Poperie are touched.* Sotcliff: chap. 3.

IN this Chapter *Sotcliff* proues him selfe vvorthy the first Syllabe of his name: for he playeth the foole so rightly (though it be the hardest part in the play) that a natural can not go beyond him, and he is as confused as *Chaos* it selfe. He first repeates, the Mission of preachers (vvhich stickes stil in his stomake, and stil crosseth his vvay) but brings nothing against it: then hee insinuateth the meanes to vvinne authoritie by the mentioned in the 5. chapter. After that, he saith, *the Pope shal neuer proue his monarchie*, and cryeth out that Papists *bring in heathenish idolatrie and mouth erronious doctrin, concerning 7. Sacraments, the sacrifice for quick and dead, Popish Purgatorie* (to followv the letter) *and that they teach that men by free vvil are able to vvorke their saluation* (vvch is a ly if hee mean free vvil vvith out grace) *that vvee are to make vovves and confessions to saintes and offer sacrifice* (vvhich also are lyes) *that vvee are to satisfie for sinnes vvhose guilt is remitted in Purgatorie, that the Pope hath power to deliuer soules out of Purgatorie*, &c. But to vvhat purpose al this is brought in here, he only Knovves, and therfore I vvill dispute of these things in more fit places hereafter. *Secondly* (saith he) *the ancient Fathers are vvholy against Papists*, &c. But if the fathers be such freinds Kellison.

of theirs, and such aduersaries to vs, vvhy do they exclame against them, and credit them no more then they vvil do a Ievv, that is vvhen in their opi-
*abone.* nion they consent vvith Scripture? *Thirdly* (saith he) *neither are the Papists comparable in number to the Turkes, neither haue they either true Succession or consent, or antiquitie that maketh for them.* But that this is a bare bragg vvee haue seen, and shal see herafter. *Neither* (saith he) *haue they prophecies or miracles.* This also to be false, I shal proue in his place. *Nor can the Pope proue his mission by miracles:* neither need he, bicause succession proues his ordinarie mission. *As for good life* (saith he) *this K. may be much ashamed of it, the filthines of Popes, Cardinals, Masse priests, monkes, nonnes, friars, being so notorious:* and yet vvhen they vvould be nought they must runn to you for it, as by many Apostates in Fraunce and Ingland to vvel appeareth, but of this also more herafter.

*Vvhat then* (saith *Sot:*) *is the reason vvhy so many adhere to Papists?* he answereth that ther are fifteen reasons: to vvit, *fire & sword, secret & trecherous practises, Excommunicating and Killing and poisoning of Kings* (& here he bringes in the Gun povvder plott) *slanderous libels, impudent lyes and fables, publishing of counterfet bookes, impudent falsification of Fathers, false imputations, diligent suppressing of holy scriptur, prohibiting to dispute, ignorance and blindines of Christians, impudent clamors and railings against al that profess the Ghospel, vigor of auricular confession* (vvhich yet their communion booke once allovved) *vvherby the Popish Faction vnderstandeth al mens secrets, bloody crueltie of the Popes agents: finally revvards and prayses giuen to those*

*that trauel by vvriting or practise to maintain the Popes cause.* Lo here fifteen motiues rehearsed, vvhich rather are scar-crovves to deterr men from Religion. And if I vvould spend in vain so much tyme I could vvith a vvet finger, shevv him, hovv they more aptly, most of them, aggree to *Sotcliffes* Religion, and hovv not at al to ours. But I vvil not answver to al his follies, least hee might therby imagin him selfe to bee vvise. If hee vvill haue true motiues to Catholique Religion, let him read Bristovves motiues, Bellarmines fifteen notes of the Church, and Campians ten reasons, and Bozius 100. signes, let him vvithout passion peruse the second booke of my Surucy, in vvhich I proue that the Catholike Church only is *Apostolike* by Succession, and conformitie of doctrine; and only hath *vnitie* in faith, and *Sanctitie* in doctrine, and only is *Catholike*: vvheras *Sotcliffes* Synagogue hath al the markes of heretikes: and both in my Surucy, and in this my Reply for it, he shal find many proofes of our Catholike doctrine and disproofes of his religion, vvhich may conuince any man of reason, not caried avvay vvith Passion.

l. 4. de Ecc. mil. c. 3. Boz. to. 1. & 2. de sig nis.

# THE TITLE OF THE SECOND BOOKE.

*The ſecond booke conteineth a Suruey of the markes of heretikes, vvhich are proued to aggree ſo fitly to the profeſſors of the newv Religion, that if euer there vvere any heretikes they are.*

TO this booke *Sotcliff* anſvvereth tvvo vvayes. Firſt he bringeth markes of heretikes of his ovvn making, by vvhich he vvould mark Catholikes for heretikes, but indeed marketh him ſelf ether for a foole, or an heretike, or both. Then he anſvvereth the chapters of this booke, vvhich euery one, do brand him and his conſortes for heretikes. but becauſe this is contrarie to his methode in the former booke, and in the bookes folovving (in vvhich, firſt he anſvvereth my bookes, and then, for an appendix or addi-

tion

tion, addeth a chapter or two, to proue the like against my Religion, which I had proued against him) I will put his markes, by which he would notifie Catholikes for heretikes, in the addition after his answere to this booke.

KELLISON.

## The somme of the first Chapter.

*As the deuil though he disguise him selfe in diuers formes, yet as they say, is discerned ether by his staring eyes, or horned head, or forked feet, or base voice, or such like: so heretikes though they shrouud them selues vnder the name of Christians, yea vnder the letter of scriptur, are bewrayed by one marke or other. The first marke is breaking forth of that societie which is commonly called the Church, as is proued out of scriptur, S. Austin Tertulian, and by reason, Yea by the Catalogue of al heretikes, who left that Church which was commonly counted the true Christian Church, and therfore were holden for heretikes. and seing that the protestantes and puritanes and the rest are descended from Luther, and Farel, and Caluin, who left the Catholike Romain Church, which euer was and still is commonly counted the true Christian*

*Church euen by Iewes and Paganes, yea Luthers Caluins, and Plessis Mornayes confession, they must needs be heretikes. To answer that the Romain Church is not the true Church, is not sufficient because it is commonly counted the true Church and those that left that Church, were euer counted heretikes. To say that they haue left the Romain Church only in those things which she erreth, is to say no more then the Arians did say. And so either they must shew another Church commonly counted the Church, in which they remained, or else confesse them selues heretikes for leauing the Romain Church, of which Luther confesseth him selfe once to haue been a member.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

TO this if *Sotcliff* would haue answered any thing towardly, he should haue either denyed that *to breake forth of the cõmon receiued Church* is a marke of an heretike, & withal, should haue answered my arguments which proue it: or else he should haue shewed that *Luther*, *Caluin*, and the rest of their first Founders, did not breake forth of the Romain Church, or that, that Church, was not counted commonly the true Church at their first arising. or else he should haue named some other Church in

which they euer continued, and vvhich was commonly counted the Church. But of a raunging and rouing fellovv, no such pertinent answeres are to be expected. Vvhat then answereth hee? first like *vvil Sommer* before he defēdeth him selfe, he strikes at vs, and rūning ouer the markes by me alleaged endeoureth to fasten them on vs: then running ouer them agayne, he seekes to vvipe them from him selfe, but as vve shal see, *Æthiopem lauat*, he may as soone vvash the white an Ægyptian. Yet let vs see first how he doth fasten this marke on Catholikes, then hovv he auoydes it him selfe.

*Hovv absurdly Sotcliff brandeth Catholikes vvith the marke of breaking forth of that Church vvhich is commonly counted the Christian Church.*

FIrst (saith he) *it is the propertie of heretikes as Kellison saith, lib. 2. c. 1. to break out of the Church and to depart from the faith: he might also haue added teaching doctrins of deuils, and forbidding to marry, and commaunding to abstayn from certain meates, and then the matter vvould haue been clare. for most vvickely they disgrace mariage. &c.* pag. 34. lin. 11.

KELLISON.

1. I Do meruail many tymes how in the same *Sotc.* there can be so litle and yet so much vvitte. for if you consider his absurdnes in answering, you vvould take him for a simple goose, but if you marke how coningly he seekes to auoyd argumẽts, you must needs confes that he is a craftie fox. For vvher as I auerred, that, *to breake forth of the societie cõmonly counted the Christian Church*, is a mark of an heretike, and to that purpose had alleaged that of S. Ihon *they vvent out from vs*, and that also of S. Paule *certain shal depart from the faith*, and that of the *Actes vve haue heard that certain going forth frõ vs haue troubled you vvith vvords*, and that also of S. Ihon *many of his disciples vvent backe*: *Sotcliff* answereth, that then Papists are heretikes bicause they haue forsaken the faith, in *disgracing & forbidding mariage to Priests and friars, & prohibiting certain meates to mõkes, and to laymen also on certain dayes, in receiuing a newv head and straung formes of Sacramẽts*. And so he thinkes that he hath branded Catholikes vvith the same marke, vvher vvith I had brãded him. But in this, first he misseth the white & mistaketh the marke. for I brãded him with

1.Io.2. 1.Tim.4. Act.15. Io.6.

the marke of *breaking forth of the Societie commonly counted the Church*, or *departing from the common receued faith*, and by that proued him an heretike, he goeth not about to faſten this marke on vs, bicauſe he ſaw he could not name the Church nor cõmon receued faith, from vvhich vvee are departed: vvhat then doth he? he goeth about to proue that we are *cloſelye departed from faith*, in the alleaged points, bicauſe in them vve *teach* (as he ſaith) *contrarie to the doctrin of the Apoſtles.* Vvhich beſides that it is no good marke (bicauſe markes ſhould be euident, and yet it is as obſcure vvho teacheth contrarie to ſcriptur, asvvhich is the right meaning of ſcriptur, vvhich is moſt obſcure) it is not the marke vvhere with I branded *Sotcliff*, which vvas departing *from the cõmon receued Church*, or *the common receued faith.* But nether do vvee teach in theſe pointes contrarie to ſcriptur as I ſhal proue: And therfore, vvheras I alleaged *S. Paules* vvordes, in vvhich hee ſaith, *certain ſhal depart from the faith:* he fondly ſaith, that I ſhould haue added the wordes followving, to vvit, *teaching doctrines of deuils, and forbidding to marry*, as though vve tought doctrines of deuils, or did forbid to marrye. For as concerning doctrines of de-

uils, not vve, but *Sotel.* and his fellovv-Ministers do teach them. For beside that they teach hereſies which are doctrines of deuils, and therfore do weare the markes of heretikes, as my ſecond booke conuinceth, they teach doctrine diſhonourable to Chriſte, to God, & to Princes, and tending to al vice and Atheiſme, as in the bookes followving I haue declared. Beſides this, *Luther* confeſſeth that he had a longe diſputation vvith the deuil at midnight, vvho fiercely impugned Catholiques *Prieſthod*, ordination and *priuat Maſſes*, in vvhich the Prieſt only communicateth: and ſeing that *Luther* in that place yeeldeth to the deuil in theſe pointes, & you in the ſame do yeeld to *Luther*, both his and your doctrine is *doctrine of deuils*. The ſame *man of God*, affirmeth, *diabolum interdum per ipſius cerebrum meare, vt nec ſcribere poſſit nec legere*, that the deuil ſome tymes paſſeth thorough his brayn that he can nether vvrite nor read. *And vvhen I ame in company*, (ſaith he) *non nocet mihi diabolus, cum vero me ſolum deprehendit, tum docet me mores*, the deuil hurtes me not, but when he takes me alone then he teacheth me manners. Yea ſaith he, *I haue one or twoe deuils of the greateſt ſort, vvch I take to be Doctours of diuinitie amongeſt deuils.*

I. de Miſſa Ang. to. 6. Ienenſ. Germ. & to. 7. Vvittemb.

to 5. Ienenſ. ep. ad ſect Saxon.

In colloq. menſ. Ger. fol. 274.

Ibidem fol. 275.

So familiar he vvas vvith the deuil that he cõfeſſed he *had eaten a buſhel of ſalt vvith him* and the deuil vvas ſo familiar vvith him, that ſaith he, *frequentius & propius mihi condormit quam mea Catharina*, he ſleepeth oftener and nearer to me, then my *Catharin. Zuinglius* the Father of the *Sacramentaries*, confeſſeth that the thirteenth day of April, in a dreame, a Spirit, blacke or vvhite he knovves not, to confirm his opinion of Chriſtes figuratiue preſence in the Sacrament, againſt the teal preſence, vvhich the Catholikes hold, ſayd vnto him: *Quin ignaue reſpondes ei quod Exodi 12. ſcribitur, eſt enim phaſe hoc eſt tranſitus domini.* And therfore *Sotcliff* and his Miniſters follovving theſe tvvoe, as their firſt founders, and that in many points alſo, they are the men that teach doctrines of deuils.

Ibid. fol. 181.

Zuingl. in ſubſid. Eucharift.

3. Concerning Marriage, Catholikes do reuerence it farre more then *Sotcliff* and his miniſters doe. For Catholikes acknovvledg it to be a Sacrament vvhich giueth grace to beare the burdens incident to that ſtate, and to confirm the marryed in their troth and loue promiſed to eche other. Vvheras *Luther* ſaith, that Matrimonie is nether a ſign inſtituted by Chriſt, nor hath any promiſe of Grace. *Caluin* feareth not to auerr that

Cõc. Flor. ſeſſ. vlt. in decret. Eugen. Trid. ſeſ. 24. c. vnic. & can 1. & ſeſ. 7. c. 1. Luth. l. captiu. Bab. c. de matr. Calu. l. 4. Inſtit. c. 19.

matrimonie is no more a Sacrament then Tillage of the ground. And although matrimonie only of al the Sacraments, be called in Scriptur by the expresse name of *Sacrament*, and a *great Sacrament*, yet al the reformers vvith one voice deny it to be a sacrament: although *Luther* also to disgrace virginitie, saith, *Matrimonium est velut aurum, status verò spiritualis veluti stercus.* Catholikes acknovvledg the bond of matrimonie to be so firme, that if at least it be consummated, it can not be dissolued but by death. *Luther* saith that if the vvife vvil be gadding, or vvil not satisfie her husband, the man may take another vvife, and his mayd also, vvhen the vvife vvil not. Yea he permitteth if one vvife content not the mans sensualitie, to take and keep moe then one. *Bucer* subscribeth saying, that so often as the man is a weary of his vvife, or shee of him, they may separate them selues and marry to others. *Caluin* also dissolueth matrimonie in case of aduoutry. Catholikes like vvise confesse the vse of matrimonie lavvfull: vvhich yet *Sotc:* and his ministers must hold to be abominable, if they vvil hold vvith their *Maisters*. Because *Luther* and many his schollers are of opinio that al concupiscece, euen that which

Ephes 5.

Luth to. 3. in 1. Cor. 7

1. expr. sub. c. de matr. to. 5. fer. 5. de mat. & com. in 1. Cor. 7. In proposit. de bigam. Buc. in c. 19. Mat. Col. 14. In fi. c. 195. 7 Cā apost. can. 50. Cōc. Gāgr. to. 1. 4. 14. Cōc Brac. 1. can. 11. Cōc. Trid. supra. Luth. a. 2. apud Roff Apol cōt. Augu.

is indeliberate, is sinne: yea they say concupiscence is original sinne, neuer remitted, though neuer imputed to the faithful: which if it be true, then the vse of matrimonie, vvhich neuer is vvithout concupiscence, must needs be sinful and detestable: and so they say in effect that vvhich one *Durand* of *Vvuldachis* sayd, to vvit, that mariage is but *occultatum meretricium*, hidden vvhordom, yea with *Tatian* that matrimonie is but *Scortatio* vvhordom. And yet vve hold it to be honest and vvithout sinne, bicause God, no autour of sinne, instituted mariage, blessed it vvith Fecunditie, and honoured it vvith his præsence, and S. Paule saith *it is good to marry though better to Keep virginitie*, and that it is *honourable in al*, that is in al pointes, though not in al persons, and he calleth it *a bed vndefiled*.

Melan. col. loq. Vvor. Cal. l. 2. c. 1. § 9. l. 3. c. 3. § 10. Kemnit. in exam. sess. 3. Trid. Apud Luzemb. de hæres. apud Epiph. her. 46

Gen. 1. 2. 9. Matt. 19. Ioan. 2. 1. Cor. 7. Heb. 13.

4. But our Minister obiecteth that vve forbid Priests and religious to marry, and so are the heretikes, vvho, as S. *Paule* forte lleth *shal depart from the faith, for bidding to marry*. I answver, that the *Apostle* speaketh of the *Manichees, Encratites, Marcionists, Ebionites, Patricians, Origenians, Apostolickes, and Priscillianists*, vvho forbad mariage absolutely, as wic-

1. Tim. 4. ex Tert. l. præscr. Chrysc. ho. 31. in 1. Ti. Iren. l. 1. c. 30. Epiph. her. 26. 30. 45. 61. 63. Aug. her. 25. 40. Hieron. l. 1. contra Iouin. ep. 50. Leo. 1. ep. 17. c. 7. Bern. serm. 66. in Cant.

ked, and proceeding from an euil God: and can not mean Catholikes, vvhoe prayse and practise marriage, and forbidd it to none but those that are to neerly linked in affinitie or consanguinitie, or haue other impediments, amongest vvhich one is the vovv of chastitie. For although our Church counselleth virginitie and chastitie to al, as S. *Paule* did, and S. *Clement* an Apostles scholler: yet she, commaundeth it to none, but to those that by vovv and promise haue restrained the libertie they had, as Priests, and Religious men and vvomen haue done: and to them iustly doth she commaund it, bicause vovves being lavvful and possible, ought to be kept. And that they are lavvful, scriptur vvil testifie, vvhich biddes vs vow and keep our vovves. *Vovv*, saith *Dauid*, *and render to your Lord God. If thou shalt vovve*, saith *God*, *thou shalt not differre to render, because thy Lord God, vvil require it. If thou delay it, it shal be reputed vnto thee as sinne. If thou promise not thou shalt be vvithout sinne, but vvhat is gone once forth of thy mouth, thou shalt Keep.* And in this, reason confirmeth faith. For if I may promise to man that vvhich is grateful vnto him, and must perform my promise, vvhen it is accepted, much more

1. Cor. 7 &. 1. Tim. 5. Ex Tertullian. lib. 3 pro epist. Pōt. c. 16.

Psal. 75. Deut. 23.

Vovves lavvful.

may I promise to God any vertue (for nothing but vertue is the matter of a vovv) it being so grateful vnto him, that he cõmaundeth it or counselleth it, as he cõfelleth chastitie by S. Paule, yea and revvardeth it also; and if I must keep touch vvith men, much more vvith God. That these vovves are possible I proue by the same scriptures, bicause that is foolishly ether cõmaunded or counselled vvhich is not in our power. And though chastitie bee the guift of God yet it is not such a guift as prophecie or the guift of tongues is, vvhich is not in euery mans povver (being but *gratis gratis data*, and not conuenient for al) but it is called the guift of God, bicause though euery one may keep it, yet not vvithout Gods grace, vvhich also is not vvanting. And therfore God nether commaundeth nor counselleth vs to prophecie, but yet counselleth vs to liue chast, vvhich is a sign that it is in our povver. Yea I auouch that ther is no vertue vvhich vve may not with Gods grace imbrace, and ther is no vice vvhich may not be auoyded: bicause there is no vertue vvhich at least God cõfelleth not, and ther is no vice vvhich he forbiddes not. And seing that chastitie is a vertue it may be kept, if it may be kept, it

1. Cor. 7.

Vovves possible.

Sap. 8.

Aug. l. de grat. & lib. arb. c. 4.

may be promised to God, if it may be promised, it may and must be performed. And
Mat. 19. therfore Christ speaking of them that *haue guelded themselues for the Kingdome of heauen* (as they haue, who by vow of chastitie haue
Aug. l. de virgin. c. 29. deprined themselues not only of the vse but also of the lawfull power of generation) saith not, *not al can not take this word*, as our English Bibles haue, *but, not al do take this word*, bicause though al may, if they demaund Gods grace, and vse the meanes, yet
χωρῖσ Capiunt. Aug sup. al do not, bicause they do not vse y^e meanes: and bicause such as do not vse the meanes can not morally liue chast, (for it is morally impossible for them that fare daintily, liue at ease, and haunt continually womēs company to lead a chast life) therfore in respect of them, Christ saith, *qui potest capere capiat*,
Mat. 19. he that can take, let him take: and to them
1. Cor. 7. that wil not vse the meanes, S. Paule giueth counsel rather to marry the to burn, that is commit fornication, if they haue not already vowed chastitie: for such must not marry, but Keep their vow, as I haue proued, & so must vse the meanes, which are prayer, fasting, hear-clothes, and such like taming exercises, that they may be able: else as S. Paule saith *they shal haue damnatiō in marrying*

*bicause, they haue made void their first faith*, that is their promise to God. Vvher he speaketh of vvidowes vvhich vvould marry, vvhose mariage yet could not be dānable, if it were not bicause they had vowed chastitie, as al the interpreters expound. Certes it is most cōuenient that preests and religious should liue chast, and so they may vow chastitie, and the Church, might ordain that none should be made preests, vnlesse they would promise chastitie. for if as S. Paule sayth, marryed folkes should absteine from carnal pleasures for a tyme, therby the better to pray: preests and religious, who should pray continually, ought to abstaine alvvayes. If the preests of the old lawe in their turnes of Sacrificing, absteined from their vviues, the Preists of the new lavv, vvho are not to Sacrifice by turnes, but euery day, must alwayes abstein. And if those carnal Sacrifices required chast Preests for the tyme they Sacrificed, much more shold our so cleane sacrifice require perpetual puritie. If *Sotcliffe* vvere not *animalis homo*, vvho vnderstandeth not the things apperteining to the spirit, he vvould see that the vse of mariage is an hinderaunce to al the functiōs of a Preist. It hindreth prayer and sacrifice as vve haue

So S. Chry so. Oecumen. Theoph. Ambro. Bede Haymo in 2. Tim. 5. Aug. in ps. 75. & l. de sāctā virg. c 33. conc. Carth 4. cān. 4.

1. Cor. 7. Vvhy Priests should be chast.

1. Par. 24. Luc. 1.

seen. It is a great impediment to studie of scripturs and preaching bicause it dulleth the head and distracteth it, and therfore *Theophrast* as *S. Hierom* recounteth, sayd it vvas not fit for vvise men to marrie. It derogateth to their exhortations, bicause it derogateth to their authoritie. for as the people highly conceueth of chast Preests, bicause chastitie is an angelical life, so they conceue basely of those that liue vnchastly or are married, as vve experience in our vviued Ministers. It hindreth almes and hospitalitie, vvhich is commanded to Bishops and Preists, they liuing of the goods of the Church vvhich are called the goods of the poore, & increaseth auarice, vvch the Apostle forbiddeth, especially in the clergie. for if Priests matrie, al they can scrape together, vvil be counted to litle for their progenie. Vvhich is the cause why so many Colleges, Churches, Monasteries, Hospitalles, haue been founded by chast preests, so fevv erected, & so many cast dovvn by our vvedded ministers. Yet by this I intend not to persvvade *Sotcliff* to leaue his vvife, bicause he is nether priest nor Clark, hauing nether vocatiō nor ordinatiō, as aboue I haue proued, rather I Counsel him to leaue his Deanrie,

L. 1. cont Iouin.

1. Tim. 5.

11. q. 1. ca. de reddit. bus cap. vobis. cap. concessio. cap. quatuor. cap. mos est. cap. cognouimus conc. Triden. sess. 25. ca. 1. de Reform.

bicause the benefice is giuen for the office of vvhich he, as he is, is not capable. And as in this vve depart nether from scripture nor reason, so nether from the common receiued Church or faith: yea vvee in this are conformable to the primatiue Church. for although the Grecians about the yeare 673. would needs haue the vse of their former wiues, (vvhich also the Romain Church permitted thē) yet it was not so from the beginning. Because the Councel of Nice forbiddeth Preists the company of al women, vnlesse it be their mother or sister, or such as are free frem al suspicion, and consequently for biddeth them the company of their vviues for they are most to be suspected. By vvhich vvee see that *Socrates* and *Zozomen* were deceiued vvho say this councel forbad not preests che vse of their vviues, vvhich they had married before preisthood: for if the Councel forbad them the company of their vviues, much more the vse of them. S. *Hierom* writing against Vigilantius, who would haue had Priests to marry, *vvhat then* (saith he) *shal the Churches of the East*, of *Ægipt*, and the *Sea Apostolike* doe, which admitteth for Clerkes, virgins and continēt, or else, if they haue vviues, such as cease to be husbandes?

Cap. com olim. extra de cler. coniugatis.

Can. 5.

L. 1 hist. c. 12. L. 1 hist. cap. 8.

L. cont. Vigil.

L. 4. Dial. c. 11. S. Gregorie relateth hovv an holy preest vvhen his vvife vvhom he had marryed before Preist-hood, came to visit him at the hovver of his death, and approched neere him, to try vvhether he yet breathed, he cryed out, *depart from me vvoman, ther remaines yet a litle fier, take avvay the stravv*: vvhich argueth that Preists liued separatly from their vviues. Yea *S. Hierom* affirmeth that the Apostles vvere single or else vsed not their vviues vvhich they before had married, the same he saith of Bishops, Priests & deacons. As for the Religious life, *S. Dionysius Areopagita* S. Paules Scholler *S. Ignatius*, S. Ihons Scholler, *Theophilus of Antioch*, *Hippolitus*, *Athanasius*, *S. Basil*, *& Gregorie Nazianzen*, *Ephrem*, *Epiphanius*, *S. Chrisostom*, the Fathers of the Councel of *Chalcedon*, And in the Latin Church, *Telesphorus*, Soter Dionisius, Eutichian, Marcellus the first, Iulius the first, S. Ambrose, S. Hierom, S. Austin, S. Hilarie, S. Leo the Great, S. Gregorie the Great, and al the ancient Fathers do mention and allow, both by vvord and deed: for many

Ep. 50.

Dion. l. Eccl. Hier. ca. 4. Ign. Ep. ad. Heronem, ad Philad. ad Smyrn. ad Trallen. ad Policar. ad Philip. Theoph. l. 1. Alleg. Hip. orat. de cõsum. mundi. ex Euseb. l. 2. c 16. Athã in vita Anton. Basil. de Virg. ser. 2. de

Inst. mõ. Naz Car 18. de virt. Ephrẽ Patrn. 49. Epip her. 30. Chrysl. de Compar. Regu & mon. l. 3 cõt. virup. vit. mon. Conc. Cal can 4. Tel. ex Dam. in vita Sot. Ep. 2. Dion. ex Dam. in vit. Eunch. l. 3. Decret. 12 q. 1. Iul. Ep 1. Anab. Ep. 82. Hier. Ep. 1. ad Heliod. Ep. 17 ad Marcel. Ep. 22. ad Eustoch. l. cont. Vigil. Aug. trac. 97. & in ps. 75. Hil in vita S. Hopotati. S. Leo ep 92. Greg l. 1. ep. 38. 40.

mar y of them were them ſelues monkes, or religious, or Chaſt Biſhops and Prieſts: and ſo vve in forbidding Prieſts and religious to marrie, or to vſe their vviues they had before Prieſt-hood or vow of Chaſtitie, are not departed from the Church or faith, bicauſe therin vvee hold vvith the true ancient Church, of vvhich theſe vvorthies vvere members and gouuernours: but *Sorcliff* and his companions haue left the ancient and common receued Church, and haue vnited them ſelues to the Nicholaites, Carpocratians, Simonians, Vigilantians, Vviclephiſts, enemies to Prieſts Chaſtitie: and to Lucius the Arrian, Valens the Arrian Emperour, the Donatiſts, Vigilatius Petilian, Conſtantinus Copronymus, the Vvaldens, Vviclephiſts, and other infamous heretikes, enemies of monaſtical and religious life: and ſo they are heretikes in departing from the common receued Church: or if Catholiques be heretikes for forbidding them to marrie, who haue vowed chaſtitie: Dauid, and S. Paule, and God him ſelfe vvho, as vve haue ſeen, forbid to breake vowes, and al theſe Fathers vvere heretikes vvho al allovv of chaſt and religious life.

ex Fenard. in l. 1. Iren. c. 1 Hier. 6. 1 cont. Vigil. ex at. 21. Conſtantię dānato. ex Ruffi. 2 c. 3. ex Hier. in cron. ex Opt. l. 2. cōt. Donat. ex Hier. l. cont vigil. ex Aug. l. 3 cont. Pet. cap. 4. ex Theoſtrict. orat. fun. in S. Nect. ex Alph. ex ar. 21. Cōſt damn.

Now as concerning *forbidding of certain*

meates, I answer, as hath been answered a 1000. tymes, that the Apostle speaketh of heretikes, who teach that certain meates, are of their own natur evil, as being created of an evil God, (such as were the *Marcionists* and *Tatians*, and *Saturninians* and *Manichees*) and therfore forbad them to be eaten. And that the Apostle meaneth only them, it appeareth by his reason which he bringeth against them, which is this, *for every creatur of God is good*. Which maketh nothing against the Churches fasting, because she cōmaundeth not this abstinence from flesh, or other meates, as though shee deemed them to be vncleane naturally, as they thought, or legally, as the Iewes held, and therfore she permitteth all meates on other dayes: but because she will have vs to exercise our obedience, to represse concupiscence, to appease Gods wrath, to be better disposed to prayer, to satisfie for our sinnes, and for such like causes. And if to fast in this manner and for these ends, be a marke of an heretike, then *Samuel*, *Dauid*, *Achab*, *Iosaphat*, *Nehemias*, *Tobias*, *Iudith*, *Esther*, *Moyses*, *Helyas*, *Daniel*, *the Rechabites*, *the Ninivites*, S. Ihon Baptist, were as great heretikes as fasters: yea God himselfe was an heretike, in cōmaunding abstinence.

11 Epiph. her. 46. Ign. Ep. 9 Iren. Lib. 2. Aug. her. 5. 46.

Why fasting is commanded.

1. Reg. 7. 1. Reg. 21. 2. Par. 20. 1. Esd. 8. Nehem. 1. Tob. 3. Iudith. 4. 8. Hest. 4. 16. Exo. 24 Hel. 3 Reg. 19 Dan. 1. & 10 Ier. 15 36 Gen. 2.

nece in paradise, & many great fastes to the Ievves: yea Christ him selfe, vvho fasted fortie dayes and nightes: his Apostles also, vvere al heretikes: for S. *Peter* did flake his honger, not vvith fesans, nor partriges, but only vvith a kind of pulse called *Lupines*, bread and olives, and sometymes hearbes. S. *Iames* neuer would eate flesh, neuer dranke vvine. S. *Marbeuves* ordinarie fare, vvere seedes and hearbes: S. *Paule* dranke no vvine as vvee gather by his so sodain sanctifying him selfe, before vvhich, as *Iosephus* recorddeth, abstinence from vvine for 30. dayes vvas required. Yea then *Ignatius* vvho commendeth lent, al those *Paules*, *Antonies*, *Hilarions*, yea *Fulgentius*, *Athanasius*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Ephrem*, S. *Austen*, S. *Hierom*, S. *Gregorie*, S. *Basil*, S. *Greg. Nazianzen*, S. *Chrysostom*. S. *Leo*, yea the Councel of Gangres and Nice, were al heretikes. If *Sotcliff* had red the prayses & commodities, corporal and spiritual, of fasting, vvhich S. *Basil*, S. *Cyprian*, and S. *Chrysostome*, and others haue recounted, he would not haue counted fasting, an heresie. By this vvee see, that *Sotcliff* is an hetetike, because in forbidding fasting, he is departed from the cõmon receiued Church and faith,

Ex Naz. Orat. de amore pro. prio. Cle. l. 7. recog. ex Hiero. in Iacobo. Hegesip. apud Euf. l. 2. cap. 22. ex Clem. Alex. l. 2. ped. ca. 1. Act. 21 nũ. 6. Ioseph. l. 2. de bel. cap. 15. Ign. ep 8. ex Hiero. in vir. Iust. orat. ad Anton. Atha. exhort. ad mõ. Amb. l. de vig. Ephr. de Iem. Aug. l. 30. cont. faust. ca. 5. Ser. 62. de sẽp. Hier. l. 2. cont. Iou. Bas. orat. 1. 2.



de Ieiun. Greg. naz. & Chryso. sæpe. Leo ser. de quadr. Con. Gangr. ca. 2. Con. Nic. cap 5. Cypr. ser. de Ieiun.

vvhich theſe Fathers and Councels imbraced, and hath vnited him ſelf to *Ærius* the heretike: and vvee Catholikes are noe heretikes, bicauſe in this vvee cleaue ſtil to the ancient Church and faith vvith them: yea *Sotcliff* by this his condemning of faſting, condemneth the conſtitution of his ſuperintendentes, for the obſeruation of *ieiunia quatuor temporum*, commonly called Ember vveekes, bicauſe that conſtitution commaundeth *abſtinence from certain meates* and *on certain dayes*, and auoucheth it to be conformable to the Apoſtles and ancient Fathers religious examples. Yea by baniſhing faſting out of his Church, he incurreth this daunger, that if he chaunce to be poſſeſſed vvith any of thoſe Kindes of deuils, vvhich Chriſt ſaith can not bee caſt out *but by faſting and prayer*, not all his miniſters, no not his vvholle Church, can diſpoſſeſs that deuil. As for our nevv Head the Pope, which *Sot:* ſaith vvee haue choſen, he is as old as S. *Peter*, & S. Peters ſo ancient ſucceſſors, *Linus*, *Cletus*, and others, as I haue proued in the firſt booke and Sixt chapter. And ſo this marke ſerueth only to proue *Sotcl.* an heretike, who is depatted from the common receiued Church, and a foole alſo,

Ex Epiph. her. 75.

Sotcl. an heretike.

In the Canons. Eccleſ. cl. 34.

Marc. 19.

vvho is departed from his vvittes.

*Hovv hardly Sotcliffe answvereth the first Chapter and auoydeth the marke, of departing from the common receiued Church.*

1. OVr dean, like a Curr, who biteth at stones, and barketh a farr of, when he dares not come neare, snatcheth and carpeth at my *exordium*, shevving by this trifeling, hovv vnvvilling he is to come to the matter. Bicause for sooth I sayd, *as the deuil by staring eyes, or horned head, or forked feet, or base voice, commonly bevvrayeth him selfe: so the heretike discouereth his deformitie by one marke or other*: he damaundeth *vvhy the deuil should rather speake in a base voice then in a meane*, and next, how I came to know *his description from his hornes to his feet*. These are his friuolous questions, which I might better contemne then answver: yet to do him a pleasur, I vvil satisfie his request. I haue read in *Luther* (who for his familiaritie with the deuil, aboue mentioned, deserueth to be credited) that the deuil hath a base voice. *diabolus* (saith he) *argumenta sua commode ad oppugnandum disponere & vrgere nouit, habetque graucm & fortem vocem*: the deuil can tel how to dispose his argumẽts

Sotcliffes trifeling.

Fol. 91.

L. de Missa Angul. to. 6. Germ. Ienen. & to. 7. vvitt.

fitly, to oppugn, and he hath a base and strong voice. Novv vvhether the reason of this be, bicause the deuils speech is no vital action, nor is framed by the right organes and instrumẽts of speech, or bicause God will haue it so, that wee may discern this Suttle enemie, let *Sot:* demaund of his Great Grandfather *Luther* vvho for his familiaritie vvith the deuil is likest to knovv. Then he asketh, vvhy, speaking of the deuil in the first part of the period, I forgot my self in the second, speaking of some member of the deuil? It vvas Sir *Sotcliff:* bicause the Printer left out these words, *Feend: so it hapneth to the heretike*, which made the sense imperfect, but are put in the end of the booke, amongest the errours corrected. But you are departed, M. Minister, from the matter, vvhen you should shevv hovv you are not departed from the common receued Church. leaue of then your trifeling, and name vs the Church, vvhich vvas commonly counted the true Christian Church, in vvhich you remained, & from vv^th^ you are not departed. *Vvee profess* (saith he) *with our mouth & vvith our hart wee beleeue al the Christian and Apostolike faith, and dissent not from the Apostolike Church in any one article of faith, professed publikely for a 1000. yeares after*

A bragg.

*Christe*. Tush, Tush, Maister Dean, these are but great wordes: & the *Puritanes or Anabaptistes* will say the same, and so might the *Arrians* also. The thing, we demaund of you, is to shew that you are not departed from that Church, which was at your first rising and still is cõmonly counted the true Christian Church, and to name the Church in which you remained? This wee, whom you cal Papists, can do. for as we liued in the Catholike Romain Church before *Luthers* rising, so do wee still, and as this Church was at *Luthers* rising, counted cõmonly the true Christian Church, so is it still esteemed, euẽ by the Iewes and Turkes our enemies, who will saye that your are start-vppes, and were once of our Church, but after wards left vs. Vvhat is demaunded.

2. But to come neerer my aduersarie, and to encounter with him foote by foote, whẽ *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, whom the *Apologie* of your Church of *England*, calleth the men whom God *sent to giue light to the whole world*, arose, I demaũd of what cõmõ receiued Church they were, before they began to preach? If So: say of the Catholike Romain Church (as certainly it appeareth *Luther* was, by his profession which was reli- Apol. pag. 114.

gious, and by his confession, which is this:

Luth. com in ep. Gal. 1. *If any other truly I, before the light of the Ghospel* (he meanes his own Ghospel) *thought holilie, and was zealous for the Papistical lawes & the Fathers Traditions* they then were heretikes in forsaking that Church, which was then, and stil is commonly counted the true Christian Church. If Sotc. seeke for some other Church, in which *Luther* and *Zuinglius* remained, besides that he shal contradict them, who confesse that they were Papists, he shal contradict his Apologie, which saith, that before their preaching, there was no visible Church, yea noe truth but only *darkenes*, til at their rising, *some glimmering beame of truth vnknown and vnheard of at that tyme, began to spring and shine*: and cõsequently, ther was no common receued Church in which they remained, but only a common receued Church of the Catholikes, from which they departed, & so were heretikes. If our Deane answer, that they were indeed once of the Romain Church, but she degenerating from her antiquitie and old faith, into Papistrie, they remained as the Roman Church once was, and so they departed not, but she degenerating, departed from them, in departing from her selfe; ne-

No Chur. of Sot. before Luther.

supra.

therfo shal this shifting fellow escape.

3. For first if the Cath. Romain Church was once the true Church, she stil remained so, and therfore they departing from her, are departed from the true Church and so are heretikes. That the Romain Church is still the true Church, if once she vvas, I proue, bicause she cã not erre in faith, but she must fal and yeeld to the gates of hel: but Christ hath *built her on a rocke so* surely that the *gates of* hel can not preuail against her *ergo* she cã not erre: and S. Paule saith she is *the pillar of truth, ergo* she can not fal: and Christ promised that the holy Ghost should teach her al veritie, *ergo* no falshood can deceue her, for then she should be ignoraunt of the contrarie veritie, and so not be taught al veritie: *Christ promised to be vvith her to then end*, but he is not vvith them that forsake him and his faith, *ergo* she cã neuer forsake the truth: Christ hath giuen her *Apostles* and *Doctours* and *Euangelists* and *Pastours to the end that she be not caryed avvay vvith euery vvinde of doctrine, ergo* she can not vvauer: and he hath prayed for Peter, her Cheefe Pastour, and in him for his successours, *that their faith may not faile, ergo* so long as she harkneth to him, as she euer hath, shee shall not faile in

the Rom. Church stil true.

Mat. 16.

1. Tim. 3. Io. 14. 16.

Mat. 28.

the Chur. can not erre.

Ephes. 4.

Luc 22.

Eph:se. 5. faith; she is his spouse to whom he is handfasted and betrothed, and for whose sanctification he dyed: *ergo* she shal neuer be diuorsed from him, nor be ignoraunt of his Secrecies, nor be polluted with heresies: and consequently if once she was the true Church, still she is: and seing that *Luther Zuinglius, Farel, Caluin, Knox, Cranmer,* were once Romain Catholikes, and now are not, they haue made a breach out of the true Church, and so are heretikes, and they also that fellow them, must needs be heretikes. Wherfore *Lactantius* very excellently saith: *It is the Catholike Church only that Keepeth the true worship of God, this is the fontain of truth this the howse of faith, this the temple of God, whether if any man enter not, or from which if any man go out, he is an aliene and stranger from the hope of euer lasting life and saluation.* Secondly if the true Church could depart from the truth, then S. Ihon had not giuen vs a sure marke of an heretike in telling vs that heretiques go forth: for if the Church may degenerate, then to goe from the Church, is noe sure mark of an heretike. Thirdly departing from the common known Church is a marke of an heretike, as is proued, but if the common knowyn Church can dege-

2.

1. Io. 2.

3.

nerate, ſo as the truth ſhal remain in a fevv vnknovvn, or not commonly known and taken for the true Church, then to depart from the knovvn Church, ſhalbe no marke of an heretike. Fourthly as *Sotcliff* ſaith that they departed in deed from the commō receued Church bicauſe ſhe departed frō the truth, ſo did *Arius*, & ſo did al old heretikes ſay, and as they proued by ſcripture, that the common receued Church ſvverued from the truth (for Arius ſayd the coūcel of Nice and the vvholl Church taught contrarie to that of S. Ihon, *The Father is greater then* I) & not by the authoritie of the knovvn-church: ſo doth *Sot:* proue that the Romain Church hath erred, bicauſe ſhe teacheth, as he thinketh, contrarie to Scriptur: but as *Arius* for al his alleaged ſcriptur, vvas euer holden for an heretike, bicauſe he departed from the knovvn Church, and vvas condemned by her, ſo muſt *Sotcliff* be, vnleſſe vvee vvill be partial: eſpecially ſeing that *Caluin* ſaith, that for faultes & errours, the Church muſt not be left, and *Pleſſus Mornay* by me Cited, and our *Souerayen Prince King Iames*, do acknowledg the Romain Church for the true and *mother Church*, and that I haue proued that the true Church can not but be ſtill the

4.

Io. 14.

Cal. l. 4. c. 2 §. 14. Pleſ. en ſon traicté de l'Egliſe.

true Church, because she can not swerue from the truth.

5. *Whereas Sotcliffe saith that he professeth with mouth and beleeueth with hart al that the ancient Church did teach for a 1000 yeares after Christe*, it is but a souldiours bragg; for besides that I haue proued that the true Church can not erre, and so, if once she taught the truth, stil she doth, he can not shew any signe or monument of such a Church & ministerie and seruice as his is, before Luther, but rather al Churches, monasteries, and monuments, argue the Church to haue euer been as now the Catholike Romain Church is in matters of religion: yea al ancient histories, traditions, Fathers, make for our religiō and against *Sotcliffes*, and therfore he and his are fayn to disclaim from the Fathers euen of the first hundred yeares, or to denye their bookes, as we haue seen aboue in the fourth and fift Chapter of the first booke, and shal see again in this booke. And I haue already shewed in this marke & chapter, how *Sotcliff* and his complices, are departed from the primatiue Church and the Fathers of the first, secōd, and third age, in their condemning of religious and chast life of religious men and Preestes, and shal

a bragg.

ſhevv the ſame in o ther pointes of Doctrine in the next mark and chapter. So that I ſee no hindrauce put by *Sotcliff*, vvhy I may not conclude as I did, that *Sotcliff* is an hereſike, bicauſe he followveth *Luther* and *Zuinglius* and *Caluin* and others, vvho are departed from the cõmon receued Church, that is the Romain Church, vvhich euer vvas the knovvn Church, and once hauing been the true Church, ſtil is: and that Catholikes, vvhom they call Papiſts, are true Chriſtians bicauſe no Church can be named from vvhich they are departed. For as they held in tymes paſt vvith the Romain Church, ſo do they ſtill, and neuer departed from it. The Concluſion.

KELLISON.

## The ſomme of the ſecond chapter.

GOOD *going before hadd, natur before arte, the currant before the counterfet, no meruail that Religion taketh the precedence before Superſtition, or that Chriſtian faith, marcheth before hereſie. The Apoſtles ſovved the ſeed of faith before* Simon Magus *ſcattered the cockle of hereſie: and in euery countrie, Chriſtian Religion vvas planted before here-*

*sie vvas entertained: and the reason is, because heresie is but an imitation or corruption of Christian faith and religion, and so that must needes go before, this come after. This being confirmed by Scriptures & fathers, the cõclusion is inferred: to wit, that the Catholikes are true Christians, the reformers of this are heretikes. For as they in the Arians tyme vvere before the Arrians, and these came after, so before Luther, and Zuinglius, and Calvin, and their Religion, Catholikes vvhom they cal Papists vvere extaunt, and so Catholikes and their religion vvere before, these men came after, and so being nevv and of later standing, are heretikes.*

*Sotcliffes answer vvith the Reply.*

OVr Dean acknovvledgeth it so true that heretikes and heresie are of later standing, that he saith *I might have spared the labour in prouing it*: then, vvheras he should first haue demonstrated the antiquitie of his Church and religion, he, counting him selfe coninger in impugning others, then defending him selfe, saith, that vvee are the men
pag. 39. that are of later standing: then he saith that they are not of later standing *for Luther is not their founder but the Apostles, nether do vvee* (saith he) *bring in any nevv faith, but reiect the*

*Popish later heresies*: and this in effect is al he saith for him selfe. So that he only denying vvhich I haue proued, and answvering not to my arguments, by vvhich I haue proued him to be of later standing, my arguments stand still in force. In the former chapter I haue demonstrated that they are departed from vs & so must needs be later then vvee, in this chapter I haue shevved hovv vvee can shevv when they began and hovv they can not tel vvhen vvee began, or degenerated: and aboue in the first chapter of the first booke, I haue proued that their Church vvas not before *Luther*, vvhich is as certain as that *Lutherans* could not be before *Luther*, and therfore th' *Apologie* of the Church of *Ingld* speaking of *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, saith that *they came first to the knowvledge and preaching of the Ghospel, vvhen as yet the thing vvas nevv, and the succes vncertain*. So nevv it vvas that al the vvorld vvondered at it, as at an vnwonted thing and vnheard of: so nevv, that *Sotcliff* in the first chapter endeuouring to proue his mission by Succession, can bring the line of his Bishops and Preachers no higher then to *Cranmer* in *Ingland*, *Knox* in *Scotland*, *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, and *Bucer* in *Germany* and *Zuitzerland*, and *Farel*

Sotcliff. Church of later standing. fol. 41 n. 5.

pag. 142.

in *Fraunce*: So newe that he can shewe nether Church nor monasterie, nor Catalogue of his Bishops, nor signe of his ministerie and publique seruice, before *Luther*, nor no monumēt of such a Church, as now they haue. If *Sot*: alleage that they teach conformably to the Apostles and so were before the Catholikes that teach contrarie vnto them, besides that he shal neuer proue that, (for Catholikes proue their doctrines out of Scriptur as wel as he and his do) in thus answering he saith no more for him selfe, then euery heretike hath done, who haue alwayes bragged (as I haue shewed in the second chapter of the first booke) that they taught cōformably to Scriptur: but he must shew that their Church as it is now, was before the Romain Church extaunt in the world. wherfore Tertulian condemneth the heretikes of his tyme bicause they appeared in the world later, saying thus: *that is truest which is first, that first which was from the beginning, that from the beginning which from the Apostles, that from the Apostles, which in the Apostolical Churches was vnviolable.* For otherwise, those heretikes also could haue sayd, that they were as ancient as the Apostles, bicause they taught consonantly

l. 4. aduersus Marcionem.

to

to their writings.

And this vvere ſufficient for the defence of this chapter, and for the faſtning this marke on *Sotcliffes* Miniſters, and for the freeing of Catholikes from it: but bicauſe *Sotcliff*, not able to defend him ſelfe, ſtriketh at vs, and ſaith wee are of later ſtanding, and vvhat he ſaith, proueth as vviſely as he is vvont to doe: I vvill ſet dovvn his reaſons and vvill anſvver them.

### *Sotcliffes arguments to proue Papiſts of later ſtanding anſvvered.*

1. *SVch a Societie* (ſaith he) *as the Pope and his adherents are, vvas neuer ſeen, for a long tyme after the Apoſtles.* But what if I deny this bold aſſertion? *If Kelliſon* (ſaith he) *ſay contrarie, let him leaue his pædanterie, and ſhevv his triple crovvned Pope vvith tvvoe ſvvords, treading on Princes neckes, & cutting their throats, his Purple Cardinals, his ſhauen Maſſ-Prieſts, his monkes, nunnes and fryars, and their retinevv, to haue continued from the Apoſtles tymes.* Soft Sir Deane, ſuffer not your ſelf to be ſo trãſported with paſſiõ. In this furie, wᶜʰ hath diſturbed your brain, it ſeemeth to you, that you haue ſayed much: but if you gather al your

his 1. argument.

The anſvver.

vvittes together, which seem to haue been gone a vvolle gathering, you shal see that you haue sayd iust nothing. for vvee speake of Religiõ, faith and Church, which wee say in vs, is as old as the Apostles, in you is of later standing. bicause your Church and religiõ, and ministerie, & seruice, and eccl siastical gouernment, vvas neuer seen before *Luther*: and you speake not of the substaũce of our Church and religion, but of the accidentes and ceremonies. Before *Constantine*, there vvere *Popes*, vvho vvere Heades of the vvholle Church, though not crowned, nor so rich as they vvere after *Constantine*: and before Constantine, euen from *S. Peter*, Popes enioyed the Spiritual svvord; temporal svvord oueral Christendome, they neuer had nether haue, though in Italie they haue had, since Cõstantines Donation, as aboue is proued. The temporal svvord out of the Popes particuler dominions, is none of his, though, as aboue also vvee haue seen, it be subiect to his, and as S. *Bernard* saith, is to be drawn only by his Counsel and commaundment, though not by his hand, vvhen the necessitie of the Church requireth: for although in temporal matters, the absolute Prince is so high, that he hath no superiour

Popes before Constantine.

l. 1 c. 1.

l. de Consid.

in earth, and can not be cõtrolled by Popes, ſo long is he keep him ſelſe vvithin his bounds, yet if he encroche notably on Church and faith, which are committed to the Pope, then the ſpiritual glaiue may controll the temporal ſvvord, becauſe ſeing in that caſe one muſt yeeld, reaſon directed by faith telleth vs, that the Temporal ſvvord muſt yeeld to the ſpiritual glaiue, that being the inferiour, this the ſuperiour. by this power Innocentius the firſt excommunicated *Arcadius* the Emperour, as *Nicephorus* hath vvritten. l. 13. c. 34.

2. Nether do Popes now tread on Princes neckes, much leſſe do they cut their throates: neuer ãy peraduenture did tread ona Princes neck, one only, to vvit *Alexander* the third, is ſayd to haue done ſo: which yet is not ſo ſure. For firſt as *D. Harding page* 188. hath anſvvered to your Apollogie, you impute this on vvhile to *Innocentius* 3. ano the vvhile to *Innocentius* the 8. and ſome tymes to *Alexãder* the third. Secondly *Platina* vvho vvrites the liues of Popes, and vvho othervviſe ſpareth thẽ not, makes no mention of this. I adde that this Pope, alſo vvas coũted a learned and vertuouſe Pope vvho canonized *S. Thomas* of *Canterburie*, and vvas

The Pope troad: not on the Emperors neck.

Plat. in Alex. 3.

er Anton. p. 2. tit. 17. c. 1 §. 10. conuinat. Sigeb.

much reuerenced of *Leuvis le Ieune King of Fraunce* and *Henry* the 2. King of Ingland, yea and of the Dukes of Italie, and state of Venice, & yet if he had done this so odious a fact to Princes, hovv could he haue been so grateful? More ouer *Otho Frisingensis* vncle to this Friderick, in vvhose neck *Alexander* the third, is fayd to haue set his foote, and the *Continuator* of *Sigebert*, though they vvrite the actes of this Emperour, his Schisme, and humiliation to Pope Alexander, and liued also in the same tyme, make no mẽtion of this, no more doth *S. Antoninus*, though he also, mention this Emperours reconciliation to the Pope, and hovv he abiured his Schisme, and prostrated him selfe, as many Emperours and Kings voluntarily haue done. So that it is like that Some German or fauourer of the Emperour, set this tale a broach, and that later vvriters, as *Nauclerus*, *Papirius Massonus*, *Carion*, and others tooke it of him. Yet vvere it true, some say, that this Emperour, hauing raysed such vvarres and *Schismes* against the Church, and humiliating him selfe only by force and constraint, and vvith those vvordes also, *non tibi sed Petro*, *not to thee, but to Peter*: the Pope, being his Supe-

otho Frising. Contin. Sigeb.

Anton. 1opt.

ex Gen. l.3. Chron. an Christi 1. pag. 366.

riour in ſpiritual matters, might in that caſe, do as he is ſayd to haue done, for the offenders greater humiliation. Vvhich vvill not ſeem ſo improbable to *Sotcliff*, vvhen he ſhall haue read the arguments, by vvhich, in the next *Appendix*, anſvvering to his 6. *marke*, I proue that *heretikes*, and *ſchiſmatikes* and rebelles to the Church, may be puniſhed, and that by *Caluins* example, vvho adiudged *Michael Seruetus*, to the fier. But becauſe I commend mildnes in Popes, eſpecially tovvards Princes, vvho in their Kind are ſubiect to none, I chuſe rather, vvith *D. Harding* and others, to deny the hiſtorie, or to graunt an indiſcretion in the Pope, vvhich yet might much be excuſed, by that Emperours to to great inſolencie, and the zeale the Pope had to defend Chriſt his honour, whoſe vicair he was, and the Churches right, vvhoſe head he vvas appointed. As for cutting of Princes throates, neuer any Pope did it. Rather Popes haue put the ctovvn on many a Kings and Emperours head: and they haue beſtovved *Ireland* on *King Henrie* the ſecond, the Kingdome of *Naples* and *Sicilie*, vppon *Henrie* the third, and *Pope Clement* the 8. hath put *King Henrie* the fourth in peaceable poſſeſſion of the *Mo-*

Popes no cutters of Princes throats, but crovvners of them. Polyd. lib. 13. hiſt. Angl.

marchie of *Fraunce*, and commaunded prayer in *Rome* for the prosperitie of our Soueraign *King Iames* at his first entrie into *England*: yea no Christian *King* almost, is crovvned and sacred, but by some Bishop, as the *King* of *England* vvas vvont to bee crovvned by the Arch-bishop of *Canterburie*, and the King of Fraunce by the Arch-bishop of Rhemes, and consequently by the Popes authoritie and good liking. Hovv ancient the *Monkes*, *Nunnes* and *Friars* are, and hovv in respect of their vowes of Chastitie, and pouertie, and obedience, they are as old as the Apostles, I haue aboue declared: the *Masse-preests*, and their Masses, are as old as the Apostles, bicause they are the Apostles successors, vvho themselues vvere Masse-priests, as I haue proued, and as their *Liturgies* stil extaunt do vvitnesse. Cardinals are aboue defended.

lib. 1. cap. 2. l. 2. c. 1.

Priests crovvnes ancient.

3. *As for Priests shauen crovvns*, vvhich is alvvayes in *Sotcliffes* mouth, vvere it that they vvere not ancient, yet that is but a ceremonie, and nether Sacrament, nor article of faith, and so can not make ether our Church or faith of later standing. Yet is that also so ancient, that Isidorus saith *the vse of it vvas brought in by the Apostles, that they, who being mancipated to the diuine vvorship, are con-*

l. de diuin offic. in Conc. Aquisgr. c. 1.

*ſecrated to God, may be made nevv, like the nazarees, their heare being cut of.* S. *Bede* our countriman, an anciẽt and learned hiſtoriographer hath related an Epiſtle, which *Ceolfridus Abbot*, vvrote to *King Naitanus*, King of the northern *Pictes* of *Britanie*, in vvhich this *tonſure*, is by him cõmended, as proceeding from *S. Peters* example, and approued by the Casholike Church, and the reaſons of it are there related: to vvit, to cal to mynd Chriſtes paſſion vvhich he indured and his crovvn of thornes vvhich he vvoare for vs, and to put vs in mynd that vve are ready to indure al reproches for Chriſt our maiſter, to ſhevv alſo in this ſhauing of our crovvn of our head, hovv our myndes ſhould be eleuated vpvvarde to heauen and God, and to ſignifie that vvee are to mourn for our ovvn ſinnes and the ſinnes of the people, for thoſe that mourned, vvere vvont to be ſhauen, as the afore ſayd Abbot proueth by the example of *Iob*, and *Baronius* alſo, by the example of Ethnikes: laſtly to declare that Prieſts are ſpiritual Kings and that they ſhould cut of al ſuperfluities, The ſame ceremonie *Amalarius* aſcribeth to Saint Peter, or ſome one of his ſucceſſors, *Otreius* alſo an ancient Biſhop, vvhom

l. 5. Hiſt. Ang. c 22.

Preiſts. crovvnes ancient.

reaſons of them.

Bar. to. 1. an. Petri 14.

l. de diu. off. c 5.

de fid. cath l. 3. cod. Theodos. Cir l. apud Ippom. to. 5.

Theodosius the elder commendeth, before he ordeined *Euthimius* lector, *he cutt of his heares according to the lavv.* The fourth Counsel of *Carthage* c. 44. and the fourth of *Toledo.* c. 40. and *Eugenius*, make mention of the same, as also the booke of the *Romain Bishops*, vvhich goeth vnder the name of *Damasus*, and vvhich must needs be as ancient or verie nere as ancient as hee, auoucheth this ceremonie to haue been commaunded by *Anicetus Pope, according to the commaundment of the Apostles*, yea, *Dionysius Areopagita* and *S. Paulinus*, and *S. Austin*, and *Epiphanius* recorde, hovv monkes vsed to be shauen. And *Socrates* relateth, hovv *Iulian th' Apostata*, vvhen he vvould fayne himselfe a monke, shaued his crovvn. And this peraduenture vvas the reason, vvhy vvhen any desired earnestly any thing of the Bishop, they coniured him by his crovvn: yea this ceremonie hath bene cõfirmed by miracles, for *Gregorius Turonensis* vvriteth, how *S. Nicetius* Bishop, vvas borne vvith a *Clerical tonsure*, and crovvn, to signifie that God had designed him to be a Clarke. and *Salvianus* telles hovv the miserable vastation of *Afrike* by the *Vandals*, hapned by Gods iust iudgement, bicause vvhen a shauen *monke*

Eugr. l. 2. ca. 16.

Dion. l. eccl. Hier. c. 16.

Paul ep. 7. Aug. de oper. mõ. c 31. Epiph her. 80.

Soc. l. 3. ca. 1. ex Aug. ep. 141.

In vit. Sanc. Patrũ. c. 17.

l. 8. de vero Iudic. in fine.

or *Heremite* came from the monasteries of *Ægipt*, or from *Hierusalem*, or from the vvildernes, and entred into the Cities of the *Asicanes*, the people mocked them as if they had been monsters. And so let *Sotcliff* take heed that God punish not him, as he did long since those that mocked *Helizeus*, and those that scorned these monkes, fos his so often bavvling against *shauen Mass-Priests*. this ceremonie then being so ancient, argueth *Sotcliff* and his hearie Ministers, to be of late stading, and the shauen Mass-Preests to be as ancient as the Apostles, and their next successors. 4. Reg. 2.

4. *Sotcliffs second* argument. *Furthermore the doctrine of the Carnal eating of Christs flesh, of Transubstantiation, of the subsistence of accidents in the Eucharist, of the communion vnder one Kind, of the Popes vniuersal headship, of Purgatorie, of indulgences, and other points decreed in late conuenticles, vvould be shevved and proued.* His 2. argument.

To this I could answer breefly, that I haue already proued that our *Church* is of ancienter standing then *Sotcliffes congregation*, and that our Church can not erre, vvhēce followeth that what soeuer this church teacheth is true, whether it be in the alleaged, or other pointes. I could answere also that although these The answer.

pointes were not al from the beginning expreſſely taught & defined, yet the Church might afterwardes determin them: for al-
Io. 14. 16. though the *holy Ghoſt* be to *teach her al veri-ties*, yet not al at once. therfore *Vincentius Li-*
l. de hæreſ. cap. 29. ca. 32. *rinenſis* hath obſerued, that as our natural body hath al limmes from the beginning, & afterwards, nature only augmenteth, poliſheth, and ſtrengthneth them, ſo the faith
a ſimilitud of the Church is alwayes the ſame in ſubſtaunce, although it be afterward dilated, and augmented by more cleare, and expreſſ definition and explication: And this only (ſaith he) the Church doeth in her Councels. But I will deſcend to more particulers. The *real eating of Chriſtes body* (which *Sotcl:* abſurdly calleth carnal, it being not eaten as
Io. 6. the *Capharnaits* imagined in a carnal manner) I proue hereafter in the laſt booke, the *communion vnder* one kind, I ſhald proue anone in the Appendix, anſwering to *Sotcliffes* ſeuenth marke, the *Popes vniuerſal headſhip I haue ſhewed* in the ſixt chapter of the firſt booke, to be as ancient as S. Peter. Tranſubſtantiation and the exiſtence of Accidents
Aſſert. 25. without a ſubiect, I ſhal proue in my anſwer to his 6. Chapter, which is an Appendix to his anſwer to my 3. booke: So only Purgato-

ne and indulgẽces are to be proued anciẽt.

## Of Purgatorie.

1. SOtcliff biddes me shevv that *Purgatorie* is ancient, or elſe he pronounceth vs to be of *later ſtanding*. And vvhat if I ſhevv *Purgatorie* to be ancient, euen by his maiſters confeſſion, is not *Sot*: an arrogant ſcholler, to cal that of late, vvhich they pronounce to bee of ancient ſtanding? *Luther* ſaith he *beleeueth ſtrongelie yea knovveth, that ther is Purgatorie*, and that *ther is mention of it in S. Mathevves Ghoſpel, yea in the 2. of the Machabees* vvhich hee admitteth, yea and S. Auſtin alſo allovveth for canonical. *Caluin* confeſſeth prayer for the dead, to haue been vſed by the Church and ancient Fathers aboue thirteen hundred yeares ſince, and the ſame man graunteth that the Church vvas pure for the firſt 500. yeares. vvhich argueth that the ancient and pure Church held Purgatorie, out of which the ſoules vvere freed by prayers. And if *Caluin* vvould not confeſſ this ancient vſe, *Tertullian* vvould, vvho reckning the cuſtomes of the Church in his tyme, amõgeſt others, mentioneth this in theſe vvordes: *oblationes pro defunctis annua die facimus*, vve ma[k]e

Purg. proued by Luther and Caluin.

ex Coel in Act. Luth. an 1521.

Mat. 12.

2. Mac. 12.

Luth. præfat. l. 1. Mac Aug. l. 18. ciuit. c. 3. & l de cura pro mort. Cal. l. 3. Inſt. c. 5. §. 10.

Oblations and prayers for the dead.

l. de Coron mil.

oblations for the dead, on the aniuersarie day. yea *Dionysius Areopagita* S. *Paules* Scholler saith, *to pray for the dead we haue receued from our masters* (the Apostles) *who were taught of our Lord*: which booke *Baronius* proueth to be the Autours whose name it beareth, and it could not be but the booke of an autour liuing not long after *Dionysius*. yea in al the Liturgies euen of the Apostles there is prayer for the dead. S. *Athanasius*, S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Chrisostome*, S. *Ciril of Hierusalem*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Austin*, S. *Greg. Nazienz.* and S. *Damascē*, allow the same prayer for the dead: and seing that prayer and Purgatorie go together (for if it be good to pray for the dead, it doth them good, if it doth them good, it releaseth them from som paynes, if it releaseth thē, it releaseth thē in some place) this prayer argueth Purgatorie: for to those in heauen prayer is not needful, to thē in hel, it is not profitable. Yea the Fathers in expresse termes do confesse a purging fier and a place of punishment from which some soules are deliuered, as S. *Ciprian*, S. *Austin*, S. *Gregorie*, S. *Isidore*, S. *Bede*, and others; and they proue this Purgatorie out of that place of S. Mathew, *thou shalt not go out till thou hast payed the last farthing*, and out of that other place

1 de Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7. Athā. ad solit. vit. agent. Epiph. her 75. Chrys. ho. 26. ad Pop. & 41 in 1. cor. & 32. in Mat. hom. 3. ad Phil. ho 21 in Act. Cir. Ca. 5 Myst. Amb. l. 2. ep. 8. Aug. l. de cura Euchir. ca. 110. l. 21 ciu. c. 24. Naz. orat. fun. de fratre & Patre Dam orat pro defun. Cip. Ep. 52. ad Ant. l. 2. ad quir. c. 57. Aug. l. 6. c. 6. Iul. c. 15. l. 21. ciu. c. 24 Greg. l. 4. Dial. c. 39. Isid. l. 1. de diuin. off. cap. de Sacr. Miss. Bed. in ca. 12. Mat.

vvhich saith that the sinne against the holy Ghost *shal not be remitted nether in this world nor in the next:* vvhich argueth that some are remitted and purged in purgatorie: yea the Ievves as Iudas Machabeus before them did do still by ancient traditiõ pray for the dead as appeareth by their booke of prayer, where their *Hazan* and publique Minister, makes a solemne prayer for the dead called *Haskaba*. So that Purgatorie and prayer for the dead vvas holden by the Ievves, insinuated by Christe, and S. Paule also in those vvordes *but he shal be saued yet so as by fier* as the Fathers expound, practised by the Apostles in their *Liturgies*, allovved by the ancient Fathers in their vvritinges: and consequently for standing to this doctrin, vve can not be of later standing, nor in any vvise heretikes: but rather *Sotcliff* and his ministers, are the later standers and heretikes, vvho are departed from the ancient Church, and are ioyned in denyal of prayer for the dead and consequently Purgatorie, with the *Arrians* and *Albigenses* and *Apostolikes* and *Petrobusians*, most infamous heretikes. This veritie might be proued more at large by Scriptur and Fathers & Theological reasons: but this may sufficie to shevv that Purgatorie is no

Vide Paulum Fagũ in cap. 14. Deut. & Genebr. in fine chronol.

1. Cor. 3. Vide Suarez. 3 p. to. 4 disp. 45. Vasquez. 1. 2. disp. 147. c. 2.

Ex Epiph. her. 75. Prat. v. Alban & Albigen. ex Ber. ser. 65 66 in cã.

newv thing. Only I vvil vse this Theologi. cal argument dravvn out of *Sotcliffes* princi. ples. he saith that a sinner is iustified by only faith, and that this faith iustifieth by appre. hending Christs iustice as his ovvn: and then say I, suppose that *Sotcliff*, at the hower before his death, should by the former faith be iustified from al his sinnes, and after that should speak but one testie or idle vvord, and dye ther vppon, vvithout repeating his iustifying faith: I demaund to vvhat place he should go? not to heauen, bicause he is not yet iustified from that sinne, hauing not reiterated his iustifying faith: or if he say that his former faith maketh this future sinne not to be imputed, then it follovveth that he that hath exercised this act of faith needs not to care for any futur sinne, and so faith shal be an occasion of sinne: not to Hel, for God should be vnreasonable and to seuere to send him to perpetual hel for so litle a fault, *ergo* he should go to Purgatorie there to be purged, and from thence to hea. uen.

*Of Indulgences.*

6. IT remaines yet to shevv the anti. quitie *of Indulgences*, else our Dean

pronounceth this our doctrine, one of the pointes defined *in late conuenticles*. This I ſhal do, if firſt I teach *Sotcliff*, that vvhich I thinke he knovves not, to vvit vvhat the povver of giuing *Indulgences*, and vvhat *Indulgences* are. *Indulgences* then, *are a remiſſion of temporal paines devv to ſinne in the invvard court of God and conſcience, graunted by the Prelate of the Church, out of the adminiſtration of any Sacrament, by application of the ſpiritual treaſur of the Church, conſiſting of the ſatisfactions of Chriſtes and his Saintes.* I ſayd *a remiſſion of temporal paines devv to ſinne*, bicauſe no ſinne is remitted formally by Indulgences, I ſayd *of temporal paines*, bicauſe the æternal payn devv to mortal ſinne is remitted by the Sacrament: I ſayd *devv to ſinne in the invvard court of God*, bicauſe ciuil paynes, as impriſonment, and the paynes and penalities vvhich followv *original ſinne*, as death and ſicknes, are not releaſed by Indulgences: I ſayd *by the Prelate*, bicauſe not euerie Prieſt can giue Indulgences, but only the Pope, Biſhops, and others to vvhom the Pope giues the priuiledge: I ſayd, *out of the Sacrament*, bicauſe æternal paynes are by the Sacrament remitted vvith mortal ſinne, and the temporal pain vvhich remaineth after

pag. 31.

the definition of Indulgences.

the sinne, is also many tymes forgiuen by the Sacrament, but this remission is not called Indulgences, as commonly they are takē: I sayd *by applicatiō of Christs and his Saints satisfactions*, to shevv the matter and treasure of Indulgences. Novv that ther is in the Church povver to remitte the temporal paynes devv to sinne in this manner, I shal easilie proue, if first I proue that there is a treasure of the Church, consisting of Christs and Saintes satisfactions, and that there is a temporal pain to be released after the remission of the sinne.

The treasur of the Church proued.

7. This treasure I proue thus. It is the sentēce of yᵉ holy Ghost, & yᵉ opiniō of Fathers, and Diuines, that *Christes merits & satisfactiōs* vvere so infinite, that the least drop of his bloud, & the least iaculatorie prayer or actiō of Christe, in that it was the operatiō of God and Man, might haue sufficed for a ful payment for mannes debt, and a complete satisfaction for al his sinnes and paynes, vvhich his sinnes deserued. wherfore S. *Paule* calles our ransom *a great price*, and Christes merites and satisfaction, *vnsercheable riches*, and saith that *this guift* of Christes merites surpassed the *sinne:* and S. *Cipryan* and *Clement* the Sixt, affirm that one drop of Christs bloud

Christes satisfactions.

1. Cor. 6. Rom. 5.

Cipr. Ser. de ratione circumcis. Clem. ext. vnigenit. de pœnit. & remiss.

bloud had sufficed to mans redemption. S. *Chrysostome* saith that the price of Christes satisfaction exceeded our debte as much as if a prince, to redeem one imprisoned for ten pence, should pay that, *and innumerable talents of Gold besides* yea saith he Christes satisfaction doth *as much surpasse the debt of sinne, as the sea exceedeth a sparkle of fier cast into it.* It is also, the sentence of the same *Holy Ghost*, yea Fathers, and diuines (as *Caluin* cõfesseth) that vvith gods grace, vvee may satisfie for sinne, and the pain also of sinne: as appeareth by the austere pænaũce of Adam, vvho to do penaunce (as S. Ireneus saith) clad him selfe in tough figgleaues: of the *Niniuites* in fasting, in vvearing hearcloth and vsing ashes: of *Dauid*, of Manasses, and *S. Marie Magdalen* and *S. Peter* and others: vvhich had been to no purpose if no satisfaction therby had been made for their sinnes. and this satisfaction *Daniel* insinuated, vvhen he Counselled *Nabuchodonozor to redeem his sinnes by Almesdeeds.* And seing these pænitent sinners euen after their cõtrition wch alone, remitteth the guilt of sinne (for God saith, that vvhensoeuer a sinner repenteth and is cõtrit his sinnes are forgiuen) cõtinued their pænaũce, it argueth that they thought that

Chrys. ho. 10 in ep. ad Rom.

Calu. l. 3. Inst. ca. 4. § 32.

l. 4. ca. 37.

Ionæ. 3. 2. Reg. 21. 3. Reg. 21.

Dan. 4. 4.

pain after the sinne is remitted.

Ezech. 18.

some temporal pain remained for which satisfaction was dew, and which by satisfaction might be cancelled. To confirm this I could produce many examples; as of the
Num. 14. Israelites to whom God, after he had forgiuen them their enormous sinne, imposed this pænaunce which to them was most grieuous, to wit, not to enter the land of promise whether then they were marching: as also of Dauid, whom *Nathan* assu-
2. Reg. 12. red that God had forgiuen his sinne, yet told him also what punishment he was to endure: Al which argueth that as after wee haue forgiuen the fault we may yet iustly exact some punishment to satisfie iustice, so God iustly punisheth vs after our sinne is forgiuen, whence followeth that ther is some temporal pain dew after our sinne for which we may iustly be punished: and
Aug to 9. tract. 124. in Ioan. therfore *S. Austin* saith *productior est pœna quam culpa &c. the pain is longer then the sinne, least the sinne should seem litle, if the paine were remitted with the sinne.* And hence the ancient custome also of the Church in inioyning pænaunces after the absolution from the sinne, proceeded: of which the *Councel* of *Nice* of *Laodicea*, *Dionysius Areopagita*, *Ter-*
Conc Nic. can 12. Laod. can 5. Dion 1 de Eccl. Hier. ca 3.

tulian, the *Canon lavv*, *S. Hierom*, *S. Ambrose*, *Origen*, *S. Austin*, *S. Leo*, *S. Cyprian* and *Zozomen* do make mention. Tert. l. de pæn. can. nihil prodest. de pæn. d. 3. Hier. ep. ad Ocean de obitu. Fab Amb. l. 5. ca. 10. Orig. ho. 15. in Ieuit. Aug. ep. 54. Leo. ep. 16. Cip. l. 2. ep. 8. Ier. de sap. Zoz. l. 7. ca. 16.

8. This being proued, I suppose that in our vvorkes vvhich are done in state of grace, there is both *Satisfaction* and *merit*, and that the same workes are called meritorious in respect of heauen vvhich they deserue, as vve shal proue heafter they do, and satisfactorie in respect of the pain devv to sinne, for vvhich they make a recompence. And although euerie meritorius worke is satisfactorie, & euerie Satisfactorie vvork done in state of grace, meritorious, yet Satisfactiō is appropriated to y^e painfulnes of the worke, merit rather to the dignitie & excellencie of the same: and so merit hindereth not satisfactiō, nor satisfactiō merit, but do simpathize in the same acte, which therfore is satisfactorie for payn, bicause it deserueth glorie hindred by pain. Now although the good workes of the Saintes, as meritorious, be fully recōpēsed with glorie, yet as satisfactorie, they are not fully recompensed in al the Saintes, much lesse in our B. Sauiour. for hee merited neither glorie nor grace for him selfe bicause he had it from the beginning as dew by right of incarnatiō: and although he me-

rited for him selfe the glorie of his body, the exaltation of his name, and for vs, our redemption, grace and glorie: yet as wee haue seen, his merit vvas greater then this reward bicause his least operation and drop of his bloud, deserued more then this. As for his satisfactiō, that being infinit, had been sufficient to haue satisfied for the sinnes of the deuils also, if God had so ordeined: and so an infinit treasure of Christes satisfactions is yet restant and remanent. The Saintes also vvho after their conuersion liued so austerly and yet so vprightly (as hovv the Apostles did wee haue seen it by their fastīg and trauels in preaching and by their afflictiōs and torments yea deathes vvhich vvee read in the actes of the Apostles they endured) had many Satisfactions: vvhich though as merits they vvere revvarded by glorie, yet could not as satisfactions be recōpensed in thē, they hauing not so many sinnes nor so much paine to satisfie for. Our ladyalso neuer sinned so much as venially as S. Austin insinuateth & the Councel of Trent declareth: and so her satisfactions also could not be recōpēsed in her. S. Ihon Baptist also neuer sinned vnlesse it vvere venially, and yet vvee see vvhat penaunce and satisfacto-

Aug. l de nat. & gra. c. 36. Cōc. Trid. sess 6. can. 23.

rie vvorkes he did. So that ether vvee must say that these satisfactions are superfluous and vnrecompensed, or that they make vp a treasure in the Church, to be applyed to others that haue need of them. And for as much as Christiás may pray and fast for one another, as Scriptur testifieth in many places, and S. Paule in particuler, vvho suffered and satisfied for others yea for the wholle Church, assureth: then vvhy may not Saintes satisfactions be layed vp for others in store? & seing that the supreme Pastour of the Church is especially to dispose of the common treasure, he especially is the man that can apply it to them that stand in need of it: and bicause the satisfactions of Saintes are not applyed vnto vs by sacrifice or Sacrament, but only Christes merites and satisfactions are so communicated vnto vs, it followveth that the cheef Pastour may applye them and impart them vnto vs together vvith Christs satisfactions out of the vse of Sacraments: and this application is giuing of Indulgẽces, as appeareth by the former definition. So that although there were noe expresse scripture for *Indulgences*, yet this Theological reason grounded in faith and scripture, vvere sufficient to vvarrant

Col. 1. 2. Cor. 12. 2. Tim. 2.

Mat. 16. & 17.

Indulg. proued by reason.

them. for if Indulgences bee grounded in the treasure mentioned, the treasur in satisfactions, and satisfactions in scriptur, as vve haue seen they are: then, *a primo ad vltimum*, *Indulgences* are grounded in scriptur. And if this be true, then are Indulgences no late thing, nor vve of late standing for holding them.

9. If *Sotcliff* obiect that the Apostles and primatiue Church made no mention of Indulgences, I could answer that S. Paul gaue *Indulgences* vvhen seing the sorovvful repentaunce and painful pænaunce of the incestuous Corinthian (vvhom he had excommunicated) he pardoned him and absolued him, *in the name of Christe*, not from his sinne bicause by sorovvful cõtrition he had vvashed that a vvay, but from the pain devv to sinne: not the Ecclesiastical pain only, for then he had had no need to vse the name and person of Christe, but from the pain devv in the court of God and conscience. yea if he had released him only from the Ecclesiastical pain, vvhich was enioined him for satisfaction, and not from the pain vvhich in the court of God and conscience vvas to haue been cancelled by that enioyned pænaunce, he had done him rather a

2. Cor. 2.

1. Cor. 5.

displeasure then a pleasure, and yet *Theodoret* vppon this place noteth that S. Paule calleth this pardoning χαριν a grace & fauour. And although before *S. Gregorie* the *Great*, vve read not of such frequent vse of Indulgences as novv, vnlesse vve say that vvhen the Bishops released those ancient penaunces inioyned by the *Canons*, they released the paines which those penaunces should haue cancelled, as I sayd of S. Paule: yet that vvas partly because then Christians vvere so teuere obseruers of the pœnitential Canons vvhich to some faultes prescribed 7. yeares pœnaunces, and so needed not Indulgences as novv colder Christians need: partly because no heretikes then impugned Indulgences, and so the Fathers had litle cause to mention them. For othervvise if to hold Indulgences had been to hold an heresie vvhy vvas not S. *Gregorie* taken for an heretike, and vvhy vvas he not wondred at as at the autour of a nevv thing, vvhen (as Saint Thomas of Aquin auerreth) he gaue *Indulgences*? And vvhy did the *vvaldenses*, vvhom *Vvicleph*, *Hus*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* followed, preach against Indulgences, but that the Church held them before their tyme? and vvhy vvere they counted heretikes for

vvhy Indulg. not frequent at first.

Th. in 4. d. 20. q. 1. ar. 13 q. 1.

12 Conc. Const sess 8. 15 19.

Rosseo. 17 Lindan l. de Panop. cap. 73

this, but for that the Church generaly admitted Indulgences? certes neuer any were holden by the ancient Church for heretikes bicause they held Indulgences, and neuer any as yet impugned Indulgences, but they impugned the common receued Church, as the former heretikes did, and Luther after them. And so *Indulgences* are of ancient, and Catholikes for holding *Indulgences*, of no late standing, but *Sotcliff* is an heretike, as the waldenses and others were euer counted, for denying them.

## The somme of the 3. chapter.

Act. 4. *AT the first when al Christians were of one hart and beleef, al were called by the same name, as brethern, for their mutual charitie, faithfull for their faith, Saintes for their holy profession: but when some began to forsake the faith commonly receued amongest the Christians, then as in faith, so in name they were seuered, and were called Simonians of Simon Magus, Ebionites of Ebion, &c. This S. Iustinus, S. Hierom, and S. Cyprian, haue obserued, and by these particuler names haue adiudged them heretikes, that amongest Christians, were so called: and good reason,*

Iust. Dial. cū Triph. Hier. cont. Iouin. Cipr. ep. ad Nouat.

bicause this separation in names argueth a separation in faith. hence I conclude that Catholikes are no heretikes: bicause although they be called Papists yet only by heretikes, as in old tyme by the Montanists, they vvere called ψυχικ. and this name is no name of any nevv authour but of the ancient Vicair of Christ: and though amongest them there are Thomistes and Scotistes, yet these are names not of the authours of nevv faith (for S. Thomas Aquinas and Scotus agreed in the same faith, and vvere neuer counted heretikes) but of diuers opinions in Schoole pointes. And though amõgest thẽ there be Benedictines, Dominicanes, &c. yet these names import only diuers manners of liuing vnder a certain rule: but Lutherans, and Caluinists, are heretikes, bicause these names are taken from nevv autours, vvho preached nevv pointes of faith contrarie to the opinion of the common receued Churche, as the Simonians, Ebionites, Arrians, and others haue done before them.

## Sotcliffes answver.

THis also is a third argument to proue him and his consorts heretikes, being al called of their Grand Sect-maister the Pope, Papists, and some of Benedict being termed Benedictins, others of Frauncis Franciscans, of Dominicke Do- pag. 15.

*minicans, of Ignatius Ignatians, of Thomas and Scotus, Thomists and Scotists.*

KELLISON.

1. THis deane is ether rash, or impudent, let him take vvhich he will. Rash if he haue not read this Chapter: for then he answereth at al aduentures. Impudent if he haue read it: for hauing read it, he could not but see, that I had preuented this his obiection and answered it. How then hath he the face to propose it again a fresh, as though it had not been mentioned?

*Sotcliff.*

*NAy leauing the cõmon name of Christians, and Catholikes, they vvill be called Catholike Romans.*

KELLISON.

2. THis is another argument vvhich he vseth to fasten this marke of *particuler names*, vppon vs. but as his manner is, he beginnes vvith an vntruth. for wee are so farre from leauing *the common name of Christians and Catholikes*, that vvee glorie in them: bicause they found nether of *Luther* nor *Calum*, nor any Sect-maister, but only of Christe

Catholique.

and his Church. For as S. *Athanasius* telleth vs, vvhen some heretikes called them selues Disciples as the Christians did, the Apostles meeting at Antioche aggreed, that al true Disciples of Christe should cal them selues Christians: and vvhen the *Carpocratians*, and others arrogated also vnto them selues this name, the true Christians added vnto this name the surname, *Catholike*, therby assuredly to be distinguished from al false Christians. And this name to this daye, is counted so properly ours, that when any speake of Catholikes they meane vs vvhom they cal Papists. I tell you then, Sir deane, as that anciēt father *Pacianus* told once *Sympronius*, *Christian, is name, Catholike, my surname, by that I ame called, by this declared.*

Disput. cont. Arian.

ex Epiph. her. 27.

Pacian. ep. 3. ad Simpr.

3. But it offendeth *Sot*: that vve are called, *Catholike Romains*: and it is not for nothing that it offendeth him. Bicause it hauing euer been a signe of a true Christian to be linked in faith to the *Apostolical* Sea, and Church of *Rome*: that name argueth vs true Christians, and *Sotcliff* and his consorts heretikes. And good reason: bicause the Romain Bishop being Christes vicaire, as aboue is proued, he that is separated from him, is separated from the Church, of vvhich vnder

Catholike Romain the only Christian.

Christe nee is the head, and consequently from Christe, vvhose vicegerent he is: and so hauing no part with Christe and his Church is a member cut of and an heretike. Vvherfore *S. Ireneus* saith, that vvhosoeuer vvill proue then selues good Christians must of necessitie aggree with the Romain Church, *propter potentiorem principalitatem, for the more povvrable Principalitie. S. Ambrose* vvriteth how his brother Satyrus, to inform him selfe of a certain Bishop, demaunded, *vtrum cum Episcopis Catholicis & cum Ecclesia Romana consentiret: vvhether hee consented vvith the Catholike Bishops and the Church of Rome?* S. Hierom vvriting to *Damasus* Pope of Rome protesteth in this manner: *Ego Beatitudini tuæ, id est, Cathedræ Petri communione consocior, super illam Petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio, quicunque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, prophanus est. Si quis in arca Noe non fuerit, peribit regnante diluuio. Non noui Vitalem, Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum, quicunque tecum non colligit, sparsit, id est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est.* Vvhere vve see, hovv S. Hierom maketh it al one, to be vnited to *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, and to be linked to the Apostolical Seat, and to the rock on vvhich the Church is built: And he addeth for *Sotcliff*, that vvho soeuer ea-

l. 3 cont. Her. c 3.

Orat. de obitu Satyri.

Hier. ep. ad Damas.

teth the lamb out of the Romain Church, is prophane, and periſheth as they did that vvere out of *Noes* ſſlud in the deluge, and that he that that holdes not vvith the Biſhop of Rome, holdes not vvith Chriſte, but Antichriſte. The ſame Doctour, recounteth hovv s. *Athanaſius* and S. *Peter* of *Alexandria*, had recourſe to the Pope & Church of Rome againſt the *Arrians*. *Optatus* proueth the *Donatiſts* no true members of the Church, bicauſe they vvere not vnited to *Siricius* Pope of *Rome*. S. *Auſtin* ſaith, that *Cecilianus*, needed not to care for the conſpiring multitud of his enemies, vvhen he ſaw him ſelfe vnited to the Romain Church by *communicatorie letters*. And as *Bellarmin* hath vvel obſerued, the Churches of *Aſia* and *Africa*, no ſoener brake ſocietie and fellovvſhip vvith the Romain Church, but they vvere generally taken for heretikes or ſchiſmatikes, and no ſoener they cut then ſelues from that body, but they decayed in Religion, ſanctitie, and learning: and like bovves cut of, they vvithered, and loſt the former ſplendour of their Church, For this cauſe heretikes haue ſought by diſſimulation to curry fauour vvith the Romain Church, that ſo they might be taken for good Chri-

In Epitap. Marcellæ.

Optat. l. 1. cõt. Parm.

Aug epi. 162.

Ex Tert. l. aduersus prax. c. 1. Socr. l. 4. c. 11. Cipr. ep 55. Ep. 2. ad Cornel.

stians, as *Montanus* and *Eustathius Sebastenus*, and others haue done. The *Nouatiās* saith S. *Ciprian*, dare sayle to Peters chaire and the principal Church &c. For this cohærence vvith the *Romain* Church as with the Head, not only the particuler *Patriarchship* of *Rome*, is called the Romain Church, but also the vvholle Christian Church. S. *Paule* in effect sayth noe lesse in his Epistle to the Romains: *I giue thankes to my God, through Iesus Christe, for al you, bicause your faith is renovvmed in the vvholle vvorld*: vvhere vvee see he calleth the faith of the vvholle world, the faith of the Romaines, that is the Romain faith.

Rom. 1.

Cip. ep. 57. S. *Ciprian* auerreth the same more plainly: for he vvriting to *Cornelius Pope* of *Rome* saith: *dum apud vos vnus animus, & vna vox, Ecclesia omnis Romana confessa est: Vvhilest vvith you ther is one mynd and one voice, the vvholle Church is confessed the Romain Church.* Saint Hierome takes a true Christian and a Romain for al one: *Vvhosoeuer* (saith he) *thou art, vvho art a preacher of nevv doctrines, I pray ther spare Romain eares, spare the faith vvhich is praysed by the Apostolical mouth.* And in his *Apologie* against *Ruffinus*, and other places, he saith that it is al one to say the *Romain faith* and the *Catholike faith*. *Theodosius* the younger in his Epistle to

Apol. cōt. Ruff. c. 1. præf. l. 2. in ep. ad Gal. ep. 63.

*Aucius* biddes him and his fellovves, *declare them ſelues, by ſome manifeſt argument, that they are approued prieſts of the Romain Religion.* So that if then, the Catholikes and Catholike faith, vvas called *Romain*, much more novv, vvhen heretikes, though abſurdly, chalenge the name *Catholike*, ought vvee to cal our ſelues and our Church and faith *Catholike-Romain*, ſo to diſtinguiſh our ſelues from heretikes, vvho neuer vvould hertofor, nor can herafter, vvhileſt they remain heretikes, obey the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, or keep correſpondence vvith him. Hence I inferr that vve are true Catholikes, bicauſe vve are Romain Catholikes, and that *Sotcliff* and his complices, vvho vvil haue no communication with the Church of *Rome*, are heretikes, appertaining to the band of the *Arrians*, vvho as *Victor Vticenſis*, and *Gregorius Turonenſis* recorde called by deriſion, the true Christians and Catholikes, Romaines, (as he and his novv cal vs Romains & Romainſts) bicauſe they conſpired in faith and ſubmitted them ſelues by obedience to the Romain Church and Biſhop, vvhom neuer yet any heretike, could brooke: vvhich, *Sotcliffe* is to note, and by it to marke, that he is an heretike.

Eutat ep. in act. Syn Eph. to. 5. Conc. c 10 edi. Pekin

Victor Vticen. l. 1. de perſeq. Vvand. Greg. Tur. l. de glor. Mart. c. 25. 30. 79.

4. If *Sotcliff* haue the vvit to anſvver that

then, and in those dayes, it was an euident signe of a good Christian, to consort with the Romain Church, bicause as then she was not degenerated: but now she hauing left the truth, it is a mark of a good Christian to leaue her: I must tel him, that if the Romain Church, and that Church which conspired with it, was once the true Church still it is, bicause, as aboue is proued, the true Church can not erre in faith: and so if then and in those dayes, it was a mark of a good Christian, to conspire in faith with the Romain Church, still it is: or if *Sotc:* will needs haue it, that she is degenerated, he can do noe lesse, then to tell the tyme when, and the Pope vnder whom, and the occasion vppon which, and the doctrin by which, she degenerated: which yet is more then a wiser man then *Sot.* shal euer be able to tell.

Fol. 12. &. 101.

Certes in the tyme of S. *Hierom* and *Victor Vticensis* and *Gregorius Turonensis* alleaged, yea in S. Gregorie the Great his tyme, Masses were layd, Preests absolued from sinnes, Saintes were worshipped and prayed vnto reliques were reuerenced, pilgrimage was in vse, the dead were prayed for, Purgatorie was holden, The Pope did the office of a supreme head of the Church, Vowes were kept,

Hieron. Vict. Greg Tur. sup. Hier. lcót. Ion. & Vigil. Greg. in dial. & ep ad Ioā. Epist. Syracus. apud Papi. Mass. 1.2. fol. 102.

kept, preests maryed not after orders, as appeareth by the same autours, and others aboue, & hereafter to be alleaged. And if notwithstanding theese pointes, it was then a mark of a good Christiã to sympathize with the Romain Church, now it is, and consequently *Sotcliff*, that discordeth with this Church, is an heretike.

5. But now, what saith *Sotcliff* to my argument, which proueth that if the old heretikes (by reason of particuler names taken from particuler autours of straung doctrine) were noted for hereukes, then *Lutherans* & *Zinglians*, and *Caluinists*, who in the same manner are surnamed, are also heretikes? For he saith nothing at al, only he saith: *Thirdly we neither call our selues Lutherians, Caluinists, Zinglians, nor any such particuler names, &c.* Be it that you cal not your selues so, is it not sufficiẽt that I haue proued that you are as worthyly called *Lutherans of Luther*, and *Caluinists* of *Caluin*, as the old heretikes were called *Arrians* of *Arrius*, *Nestorians* of *Nestorius*, and *Pelagiãs* of *Pelagius*? But you also do call your selues so, as appeareth by your bookes which you write one against another, and is plainly to see in Fox his Historie where recounting the Actes of *Luther*, you he calleth

pag. 40. 5. Thirdly.

Sotc. answered.

For instãce by the 3.

*Lutherans, Zuinglians, Sacramentaries.* If *Sotcliff*, yet answer that they leaue the ancient Church in those pointes only in which she hath left Scriptur, and follow *Luther* and *Calain*, bicause they first discouered these points, and so for this only cause are called *Lutherans* and *Calainists*: besides that this answer is aboue reiected, bicause it maketh the bare letter of Scriptur together with the priuat spirit, Iudge against the common receaued Church, it is no other answer nor excuse, then the *Arrians* and *Nestorians* did make, and so if they for particuler names taken from particuler autours of new doctrin, were iustly condemned for heretikes, *Sotcliff*, and his cōsortes must abide the same condemnation.

## The somme of the 4. chapter.

*HAuing proued at large that a man can not be saued in al Religions, and that one heresie is sufficient to seuer and separate a Christian from the Church, and consequently to deprive him of salvation: I infer thence, that the reformers of this age, must needs be heretikes, bicause they haue renewed and raked together almost al old heresies, as is proued: and so if ancient heretikes for seuera*

*heresies, vvere accurſed for heretikes, much more accurſed heretikes are theſe reformess, vvho haue aſſembled them al together.*

*Sotcliffes anſvver, vvith the Refutation.*

KELLISON.

TO this *Sotc.* anſvvereth tvvoe vvayes: firſt, like *vvill Sommer*, he ſtrikes at vs prouing that vve haue renevved many old hereſies: Secondly he endeuoureth to cleare him ſelfe and his conſortes from the renevving of thoſe old hereſies, vvhervvith I had charged them.

*Hovv fondly Sotcliff chargeth Catholikes vvith renevving old hereſies.*

SOTCLIEF.

*ALthough* (ſaith he) *it be not incident to al heretikes to renevv old hereeſies*, (as it ſeemeth indeed to haue been reſerued for him and his conſortes) *yet it is a verie eminent qualitie in the Papiſtes. From the Simonians they haue borrovved their practiſe of buyng and Selling Eccleſiaſtical matters, and the vſe of Concubines.*

KELLISON.

1. IF euer any Sectmaster had been called *Sotcl.* this *Deane* might very fitly haue been Surnamed of him: vvho hath not the vvitt to distinguish betwixt faith and vvorkes, doctrine and manners. For as I shal tel him in his appendix to this booke and 9. marke, heresie is an errour in the vnderstanding, and so to beleeue vvrongly makes an heretike, to do euilly makes only an euil Christian. Be it therfor that Papists *practise buying and selling of Ecclesiastical matters, and vse concubines*, yet vnless *Sotcl:* proue that they teach this to be lawful (as Simon Magus did, vvho taught also al vice to be lavvful, or not hurtfull to them that *imbraced his faith*) he is a *Sott:* to pronounce them therfore heretikes. Nay Catholikes are so farr from teaching this, that their canon lavv forbiddeth *Simonie* and punisheth it seuerly. Yea *Gregorie* the 7. excõmunicated *Henry* the fourth for selling the Bishoprieke of *Constance*, and deposed one *Charles*, that had bought it, as *Marianus Scotus* in his 3. booke and 6. age relateth. But if to sel and buy benefices be sufficient to make an heretike, then *Beza* was a notorious heretike, for he hauing sold

Th. 22. q. 11. a. 1. Catho. 20 Simoniãs. Iren. l. 1. c. 20. Amb l. 2. de pœn. c. 4. 1. q. 1. ca. Petrus.

1. q. 1. c. gra ria. ex. Epis cop' c. qui perpetã. c. Sa. Parrũ. c. qui stu det. c. qui cunque. c ũbquæst. c. gratã. c. Grecio c. ven tum est. c. Petrus. c. Simoniaca hæresis. tit. de Simonia.

Liure 8. de la naissance de l'heresie.

his Priorie to one *Guillard*, Lord of *Longemeau*, made his Fermers, to pay the reuenewes to him before hand, as *Raimond* in his 8. booke *de la naissance d'heresie*, and al Fraunce recordeth. And the *Protestaunts* are also heretikes, vvho, as the *Puritans* tell them in their *Admonition to the Parlamẽt, by running and riding, and vnlavvful sutes, and buying, do preuent others more capable of benefices*. And if any vvould be so curious as to examin hovv *Sorcliff* came to his Deanrie, he might peraduentur finde matter enough to proue him a *Simonian*. Pag. 1.

2. Bee it also that *Papists* did practise *concubinage*, yet that can not make them *Simonians* becaus they teach it not to be lavvful, as *Simon Magus* did, but condemne it to hel euen in their canon lavv also, and *Gregorie* the seuenth interdicteth al Priests, Deacons, and Subdeacons, vvhich vse concubinage. But if *Sotel.* had been in his vvittes he vvould neuer haue mentioned *Concubinage*, it hauing been the source and fondation of his Religion, as appeareth by *Luthers Borra*, *Bezaes Candida* a Tailors wife of Paris, *Calvins* Trul, *Cranmers* Queane, vvhich he carryed about vvith him in a Tronke, Bales Dorothie, and by so many apostating Priests, Monkes, and Supra. cap. vlt. de Cohab. cler. & mulier. cap. Si qui sunt. 27. ibiterd. 82. Cochlæus. Gul. Luth. Gul. in Chron. Raimund sup. Bolsec

Sand.l.1. de schism. Ang. Three cō. nections 3. p. pag. 371.

fryars, the first stones of this new building, whose supposed wiues, were Queanes and concubines, and therfore their children by the Canon, Ciuil, yea and common law of England, are bastards in the highest degree.

SOTCLIFF.

*FRom the* Carpocratians *they haue taken the worship of Images.*

KELLISON.

3. AS wel he might haue sayd that Inglish men take their kneeling vnto the Prince from the idolatours that worshipped *Bel*, *Iupiter*, *Saturnus*, and their Emperours and Princes for Goddes. If *Sotcliff* answere that Inglish men kneel not to their Princes as to Gods as they did: so say I that Catholikes worship not images as the *Carpocratians* and *Simonians* did. For the *Simonians* honoured *Simon Magus* and *Selene* his strompettes pictures, as Ireneus witnesseth, and framed them like to *Iupiter* and *Minerua*. And Origen writeth that they taught their followers to *adore Idols*. The Carpocratians *Simons* scholers also, vsed painted pictures, yea pictures of gold, and siluer, which they

How heretikes honored Images.

Ex Iren. l. 1. c. 20. Orig. l. 6. cont. Celsum. Iren. l. 1. c. 25. Epiph. her 27.

sayd vvere *Iesus* his pictures drawvn in his life tyme, and they placed these pictures pel mel, vvith the pictures of *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, and *Aristotle*, & offered sacrifices vnto them, and enchaunted them vvith heathenish superstitions. But Catholikes vvorship the images only of God, Christe and his Saints and blessed Angels, and they vvorship them not as Gods, nether do they enchaunt them or offer Sacrifices or make any prayers vnto them, vvel knovving that Images haue nether diuinitie nor life in them, yet are to be respected for their sakes, vvhom they represent. And this vve take not from *Carpocratians*, but from *Christ*, vvho sent his image vnto King *Abagarus* and imprinted another in a cloth to recompence the deuotion of that vvoman, that vviped his face, vvhen he caryed his heauy crosse: vve take this from S. *Luke*, vvho painted for the first Christians deuotion, the pictures of *Christe*, our *Lady*, and S. *Peter*, and S. *Paule*: vve take this from before *Constantine* the *Great* to vvhom S. *Silvester* shewed the pictures of S. *Peter* and S. *Paule*, vvhich Constantine affirmed to be like to them that had appeared vnto him: Vve take this from the example of the vvoman cured by our Sauiour of the bloody

Antiquitie of Images. Ex Euagr. l. 4. c. 26. Menol 17 Kal. Sept. ex Conc. Nic. 2. Dam. l. 4. c. 17. Niceph. l. 2. c. 7. Adr. ep. ad Car. ex Method. apud Mar. Scot. an. dom. 39. & Bar. to. 1. an. 34 ex Niceph. l. 6. c. 16. ex B. Ier. to. 3. an. Christi 324.

flux, vvho erected in memorie of that miracle, a brasen statua of our Sauiour, to the skirtes of vvhich vvhen a certain hearb that grevv thereby, reached, it cured al diseases, vvhich statua *Eusebius* saith he savv, as also the ancient Images of S. *Peter* and S. *Paule* vvho also makes mention in the next chapter of the chaire of S. *Iames* the first Bishop of *Ierusalem*, which he saith is had in great veneration. Vve take this from the practise of the Church in *Constantines* tyme, vvho vvas taught to adorne Churches vvith statuaes of marble, Gold, and Siluer, yea and in saint *Austines*, and S. *Basils* tyme, vvho tell vs that in their tyme it vvas the custome to paint Christe, vvith the picture of S. *Peter* on one side, and S. *Paule* on the other side. And this vse of Images *saincte Paulinus* mentioneth, and the same, as *saincte Bede* auerreth, vvee receiued vvith our Christianitie, bicause *saincte Austin* the monke, and his companions caused to be caryed before them at their first entraunce into Ingland, a siluer crosse and an Image of our Sauiour, vvhich then were common ensignes of the Christians. In *saint Chrysostomes* liturgie, the Priest vsed to incline to *Christs* Image. And in this these Christians dishonoured not Christe, bicause they

Euſ. l. 7. c. 14. 15.

Ex l. de Rom. Pōt. in Silu.

Aug. l. 10. de cōſ. Euang. c. 16.

Basil. orat. in S. Barlaam.

Paul. ep. 12. & in nat. 10. S. Pelag.

Bed. l. 1. hiſt. gent. Angl. c. 25.

Liturgia verſa per Erasmum.

kept and reuerenced these Images, not as goddes, but as Images of him & his Saintes: rather thus they honoured Christe, bicause as saint *Ambrose* saith: *Vvho so crovvneth the Image of the Emperour, honoureth him vvhose Image he crovvneth.* And as S. *Gregorie* told *Secundinus, that he vvas sure he demaunded not the Image of our Sauiour to vvorship it as God, but for reuerence of the Sonne of God, that he might inflame him selfe vvith the loue of him, vvhose Image he desired to haue before his eyes:* So al other Christians vvere taught to do: ffrom these then, and not from the *Carpocratians* haue we taken the worship of Images. And *Sotcliff* and his ministers vvho haue broken and cast dovvn al Images in England, haue not taken this from the primatiue Church, nor from the ancient Bishops and Kinges and people of Ingland (for from Inglands first conuersion Images vvere in request till King Edvvard the sixt his tyme) but from *Iulian* th' *Apostata* who caste down the afore sayd brazen statua of Christe, and set his ovvn in the place, yea from the *Manichees*, *Marcionits*, *Eutichians*, yea from those infamous *Iconoclasts* and *Image-breakers*, *Philippicus, Leo Iconomachus, Constantinus Copronymus* (so called for beraying the font at his ba-

In ps. 118. l. 7. ep. 53.

Ex Tharasi. in cõc Nic. 2. Paul. Diac. in vit. Phil. Cedren. in cõp. Zonar. in vit. Phil. Cedren. an. 711. Paul. Diac. in vit Leonis.

ptizing) and others long since condemned by the *second Councel* of *Nice*, and the vvholle Christian vvorld.

SOYCLIFF.

*FRom the Collyridians they haue taken the saying of Masse or offring their vvafer Cakes in honour of our Lady.*

KELLISON.

4. OVR *saying of Masse*, vve take from Christ him selfe, vvho as aboue I haue proued, at his last Supper said the first Masse and offered his body & bloud as a true sacrifice, and cõmaunded the Apostles, and in them their successors, to do the same, as there also is declared: vv^th^ commaundemẽt they fulfilled obediently, as their *Liturgies* or *Masses* yet extaunt vvil vvitnesse. And of this *Sacrifice* and *Masse*, *S. Irenæus*, *S. Ignatius*, *S. Iustinus*, *Tertulian*, *S. Cyprian*, *S. Hierom*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Austen*, and *S. Chrysostome* do giue ancient testimonie. S. Austin in particuler telleth hovv by saying Masse, an howse was dispossessed of euil spirits. Yea *Pope Pius* the first of

sup. fol. 26

Iren. l. 4. c. 31. & 34. Ign. ep. 9. 10. 14. Iustin. orat. ad Anton. Tert. l. de cor. mil. Cipr. ep. 63. Hier. ep. 1. & 150. ad Med. q. 2. Ambr. l. 4. de sacr. c. 4. Orat. præp. ad Miss. Aug. l. 13. ciu. c. 8. Chrys. l. 3. de sacerd. Pius ep. ad Iustum. Bibl. Sa. Pat.

that name and the Eleuenth Pope, Cornelius Pope, the Councel of Rome vnder *Silueſter*, the 2. *Councel of Carthage*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auſtin* & *Victor Vticenſ.* do make expreſſ mẽtion of *Maſſe*. Yea S. Auſtin reprehendeth thoſe that for vvant of deuotiõ compell the Prieſt to ſhorten his *Maſſe*, and ſo vvould much more reprehẽd *Sotes* who wil haue no *Maſſe* at al, I can not here omit, hovv in the *Proconſulair Actes* of *Saturninus* vvhich *Surius* ſetteth down in his firſt tome and the 11. day of Februarie, as alſo *Baronius* in his third tome and in the 303. yeare of our Lord: *Saturninus* vvith 4. of his children, vvere examined, as novv Catholikes are in England, about celebrating the *Collecta* & *Dominicum*, vvᵗʰ vvas Maſſe. *Saturninus* the Prieſt being aſked vvhy he celebrated *Dominicũ*? anſvvered *quia non poteſt intermitti Dominicum, becauſe Maſſe can not be intermitted*. And *Fœlix* confeſſing him ſelfe a Chriſtian, the *Proconſul* ſayd, I aſke not that (as now in Ingland they examin not ſo much vvhether men be Catholikes, as vvhether they be Prieſts or haue ſayd or hard Maſſe) but vvhether thou haſt been in *Collecta*? *Fœlix* anſvvered: as though a Chriſtian can be vvithout *Dominicũ Maſſe*, or Maſſe vvithout a Chriſtian? another anſ-

Conc. ep. ad Lupicin Conc. Rõ. in fine.
Cõc. Cartha. 1. can. 3 Amb. ep 33. Aug. ſer. 151 de Tẽp. Vic. l. 1. perſeq. Vvand.
Maſſe anciẽt.

vvered that *the hope and saluation of Christians is in Dominico, in the Masse.*

5. Now as concerning the *Collyridians*, from vvhom *Sot*: fooliſhly ſaith vve take ſaying of Maſſe, I muſt tel him that they vvere neuer counted heretikes for allovving Maſſe: for then the ancient Fathers and beſt Chriſtians alleaged, ſhould be alſo heretikes, but bicauſe their vvomen offred ſacrifice, vvhich dignitie (ſaith *Epiphanius*) only pertaineth to men and Prieſts, not to vvomen no not to *Eue* nor the B. Virgin, and they offered their ſacrifice called *Collyrida* that is *torta panis* a cake of bread vnto our Lady. Nether of vvhich thinges can be imputed to Catholikes. For they permit not vvomen to ſacrifice or ſay *Maſſe*, and they offer ſacrifice only to God, to our Lady none, bicauſe though ſhe be the mother of God and a moſt holy creatur, yet no *Goddeſſe*, and ſo not to be honoured vvith ſacrifice, vvhich (as S. *Auſtin* ſayth) is properly devv to God. No ſuch teſtimonies, can *Sotcliff* produce for his *Cene* or ſupper of the Lord, and neuer did the world ſee any miniſter, or communion booke, or cõmunion table of it. Yea *Illyricus* and *Conradus* condemne *Caluins* liturgie and the Pu-

Ex Epiph. her. 78. 79. l. 3. to. 2.

Catholikes no collyridians.

Illyric. in defenſ. cõfeſſ. Luth. c. 7. Con: L. 5. de Theol. Caluin. Puritani in admon. ad Parlam. pag. 45.

titans of Ingland, the communion booke euen vnto hel.

*Sotcliff.*

*FRom the Marcionists they haue taken the baptisme of Christians by vvomen, and their limbus Patrum.*

KELLISON.

6. THe *Marcionists* (Sir Deane) are condemned for heretikes, not for that they permitted vvomen to baptize: but for that they reiterated baptism, and permitted vvomen to baptise solemnly and in presence of Priests, vvhen ther vvas no necessitie (as *Epiphanius* expressely relateth) in which wee Catholikes hold not vvith them. For vve teach that baptisme can not be reiterated bicause it imprinteth an indelible caracter, & that it must not be ministred solemnly by the lay men or vvomen, but by a special minister. Yet bicause this Sacramẽt is so necessarie, that no children can be saued vvithout it, nor nor others vnlesse they receue it at least *in voto*, in desire: as it vvas for that cause instituted in vvater vvhich is easilie gotten, so Christ in necessitie requireth not a Priest, but permitteth euery one, man, or

Epiph. her 42. Catholi. no Marcionists.

vvoman, to minister it, least the child should perish. And therfor *Tertulian* saith that lay men may baptise in necessitie. And the Apostles baptized before they vvere preests, and as *saint Ambrose* affirmeth, they gaue leaue to their brethern that vvere not ordeined, to baptize: *Athanasius* also, but then a child, baptized, and his baptism vvas approued by the Bishop of Alexandria: *Nicholaus* Pope defineth that baptisme ministred by a Iew is effectual if he vse the matter and forme, and intendeth that which the Christian Church therin intendeth. Vvhich argueth that Ordination is not necessarie, and that consequently woemen in necessitie may baptize, bicause they can not be prohibited this, but only bicause they are not capable of ordination. Vvherfore *Pope Vrbanus* hath defined that it is true baptism which a vvoman ministreth in necessitie, as also hath the *Councel* of *Florence*. But *Sotcliff* if he vvould practise according to his doctrin, must reiterate *Baptisme*, bicause as *Bellarmin* hath vvel proued ther is no reason vvhy *Baptism* can not be reiterated, but becaus it imprinteth a *Caracter*, and so *Sotcl:* denying al *Caracters*, must rebaptise vvith the *Marcionistes*. Likevvise they permitt ministers to baptise, vvho are

l. de baptismo.

Ambr. in c. 4. Ephes

cap. a quodã Iudæo. de cons. d. 4.

30. q. 3. super quib.

Conc. Flo. in decreto vnionis.

To. 2. l. 2 de effec. Sac. c. 22. §. Tertia ratio.

lay men, bicause they haue nether order nor vocation, as aboue is proued, and so can not exclude vvomen from baptizing. *Luther* also sayth that al are Priests a like and so vvomen as vvel as men may minister Sacraments. Lastly they hold that the Prince is Suprem head of the Church of Ingland, and consequently he that giueth authoritie to others, may preach and minister Sacraments him selfe as aboue also I haue inferred: and consequently when the Prince is a vvoman, she may baptise and minister Sacramẽts. And so it is, Sorc. that holdes with *Marcion*, not wee. booke 1. chap. 1. fol. 32.

7. As for *Limbus Patrum*, *Sotel:* fondly imagineth, that vve take it from *Marcion*. For although he graunted only the Resurrection of soules, and baptized the dead, as though the soules departed, could be helped (both which argeyv that he granted a place for the soules after their separation from their bodyes) though he affirmed also as *Ireneus* reporteth that Christ descending to Hel, deliuered *Cain* and the *Sodomites*, but not *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noe* and the Patriarches, vvhich insinuated a *Limbus:* yet vvee detest those his principles: and take our *Limbus Patrum* from better autours, as from *Iacob vvho*, in a great anguish of mynd sayd, *I vvill descend mour-* l. 1. c. 84. Gen. 37.

ning in to Hel, that is the low *limbus*, in which the Patriarches and Saintes of th'old lavve expected the *Messias*, vvho vvas to deliuer them and to open heauen gates vnto them:

Zach. 9. as from *Zachare*, vvho writeth that the *Messias* hath, that is shal (for like a prophet he speaketh of futur thinges as if they vvere past) deliuer the captiues *out of the lake in vvhich is no vvater*. By vvhich lake *saint Hierom*, *saint Ciril*, *saint Thomas*, and *Ribera* vnderstand *Limbus Patrum*: as from *Samuel* also, vvhose soule ascended from this place, as scriptur in plain vvordes affirmeth, and *Iosephus*, *Iustinus martyr*, *saint Basil*, *saint Ambrose*, *saint Austin*, *Lyra*, *Abulensis*, *Dionysius Carthusian*, and *Caietan* confirmeth. Yea vve take this from our creed vvhich saith Christ *descended in to Hel*, that is into *Limbus*, the highest part of Hel, vvhere the Saintes of the old lavv expected their Messias: vvhich Sotc must graunt also, vnless by Hel in the *Creed*, he vnderstand the *Graue* vvith *Beza*, or the paines only of a damned soule, vvith *Caluin*, and so deny al local hel.

Hiero. & Rib. ibid. Cir. epist. 14. Th. 3. p. q. 52. a. 1. 1. Reg. 28. Eccl. c. 46. Ioseph. l. 6. Ant. c. 15 Inst. dial. Basil. ep. 80. Amb. in c. 1. Luc. Aug. l. de cura pro mort. c. 15. Lyr. Abul. Dion. Caietan. in 1. Reg. 28. Beza in c. 2. Act. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 16. §. 9.

SOTCLIFF.

FRom the *Valentinians* and *Manichees* they haue taken their opinion of the being of Christes

*ſtes body in the Sacrament vvit. out ſolidities.*

KEILLON.

8. IGnorance of the Valentinians opiniõ, makes this man thus bold in pronouncing. For *Valentinus* vvas of opinion that Chriſte had an heauenly body, taken from the heauens, vvith vvhich he paſſed thorough the *virgin*, as thorough a Pipe, born in her, but not of her, bicauſe he tooke no fleſh of her. Vvhich opinion, as it can not ſtand vvith a mannes true body, vvhich is compoſed of fleſh and bloud, ſo doth it not neceſſarily imply, that Chriſtes body was not ſolid, bicauſe the heauens themſelues, of vvhich *Valentinus* ſayd Chriſte took his body, are corpulent and ſolid. The *Manichies*, I graunt, imagined that Chriſt had an imaginarie and phantaſtical body, in vvhich he appeared as man, but was not, ſeemed to be borne, but was not, ſeemed to ſuffer and dy, but did not: vvhich opinion, *Cerdon* before *Manicheus*, and *Marcion* alſo followed: as *Ireneus*, Tertulian, *Epiphanius* and S. *Auſtin*, do affirm. But, that Catholikes teach this, it is as falſe as *Sotel.* is. for vve confeſſe that Chriſt had and yet hath a ſolid body: and as Chriſts immortalitie in heauen

ex Tertul. l. de carn. Chriſti.

Epiph. her. 66. Aug. her. 46.

Iren. l. 1. c. 28. Epiph. her 41. Tert. l. preſcr. ca. 37 l. 1 cõt. marcionẽ. c. 19.

Christs true body in the Sacrament.

destroyeth not his true body in substaunce but only perfiteth it in qualitie: so his Sacramental and indiuisible manner of existence in the Sacrament, chaungeth not his substaunce, but the manner of his existence. For if the true and solid body of Christe, retaining soliditie, could so penetrate the place as it vvas in the same place vvith the stone of the graue, vvhen it arose to life, the stone vnremoued, and vvith the substaunce of the dores, vvhen it entred, the dores being shutt, and vvith the substaunce of the heauens, vvhen it passed them in the Ascension vvithout diuision: vvhy may not it bee in a lesse place then it selfe, vvhich could bee in the same place vvith another body without excluding it? And vvhy may not this one body bee in tvvoe and diuers places, as vvel as diuers bodyes, could be in one place?

SOTCLIFF.

*FRom the Pelagians they haue taken the denial of original sinne in the blessed Virgin, the perfection of Iustice and impeccabilitie of Christians.*

KELLISON.

9. THe more this man lyeth the more he thinkes he may, and after he hath

once passed the limits of modestie, *gnauiter impudens est*. For the *Pelagians* denyed absolutly original sinne, and auerred no children to be infected with it as S. Austin affirmeth: vvee, hold the infection of *original sinne* to be such, that none generally can escape it, vvhich also the Councel of Arausi. and Mileuet, and of Trent haue defined. If *Sotcliff* vvill inferre that *vvee haue taken the denial of original sinne from Pelagius*, bicause vvee exempt the B. Virgin from it, hee shal shevv him selfe a vvise man. For first it is in question amongest vs (as being not defined by the Church) vvhether shee vvas preserued or noe. For *saint Thomas* and the *Thomists* and *Alexander* of *Hales* before them, affirm that shee contracted original sinne, though she vvere by and by sanctified in her mothers vvombe. *Scotus* and many his followers affirm that she vvas præserued, bicause it vvas not conuenient that the mother of God should euer be y^e^ daughter of the deuil. But if *Sot.* of one particuler, vvhich also is in question, vvill inferre vs to be *Pelagians*: much more may vvee conclude him and *Caluin*, his maister and *Zuinglius* and *Oecolampadius*, to be *Pelagians*, who affirme that al the children of faithful and the predestinate, are so sanc-

1. de bar. c. 88
Conc. Arauf. c. 2.
Conc. Mile. c. 2.
Trid Sess. 5. can. 2.
Th. 3 p. q 27. a. 1.
Scot. in 3. d. 3.
Cala. l. 4 Inst. 1. 6

Zuing. l. de bap. cont. vrban. Reg Oecolam. resp. ad confess. Luth.

fied in their mothers womb by faith of their parentes, that this infection takes not hold of any of them: yea *Zuinglius*, and *Oecolampadius*, haue freed al children from this infection, and so are fully *Pelagians*. Vvheras *Sot.* addeth that Catholikes haue also take from the *Pelagians*, the perfection of iustice and the impecabilitie of Christians, it is another marke of his ignoraunce. For the *Pelagians*,

ex Aug. l. de her. ca. 88.

held that men vvithout grace might keep the commaundemēts: and that *the iuste mans life is vvithout al sinne*: wee defend that vvithout Christes grace, no man can obserue the cōmaundements: and wee teach and preach that euen the Apostles, after their confirmation in grace by the coming of the holy Ghost, sinned some tymes, venially, & that euen the iustest mē are subiect to venial sinnes, & do some tymes also offend mortally: though vve hold also that the B. virgin by priuiledg neuer sinned venially. And so wee hold not our iustice to be so great as to make vs impeccable (as you hold that it makes no sinne to be imputed) yet vvee say it makes vs truly iust, & truly sanctifieth vs from sinne, and not only couereth them as you say. of vvhich vve shal say more in the next booke. Vvheras *Sot.* also assureth his reader

Catholikes no Pelagians.

Cōc. Trid. sess. 6. can. 23. Aug. l. de nat. & grat. 36.

that vvee haue deriued other branches of old hereſies from other heretikes, as at large he hath proued in his late chalenge, it is but an accuſtomed bragge, as he that hath anſvvered his chalenge declareth, & ſo it ſhall paſſe here vvithout anſwer, bicauſe he nameth not any hereſie in particuler.

*Hovv vveakely Sotcliff anſwereth this chapter, and hovv hardly (or not at al) he auoideth the marke of renevving old hereſies, by me imputed vnto them.*

SOTCLIFF.

*FOurthly vve renounce al old hereſies condemned by ancient Councels, and pronounce Florinus that held God to be the Authour of ſinne Anathema. The like vve ſay of Eunomius, Pelagius, and their conſorts. Nether vvas Caluin of other opinion, but that his malicious enemies do falſely impute vnto him, that he ſhould teach that God is the Author of ſinne.* pag. 40.

KELLISON.

THis man vvill ſtill be the ſame man, do vvhat vve can: that is, he vvill ſtill perſiſt in bold and bare affirmations & denials, and thinkes ſo to carry it avvay. I affirmed that they teach vvith Simon Magus and other ancient heretikes, that God is the Au- pag. 184. Edit. 1. pag. 105. edit. 2.

thour of sinne, and had cited *Caluins* opiniõ out of *Bellarmin*, hee vvithout other clearing him or explicating him, denieth boldly. But vvhether I in charging him and others, or he in discharging them, haue dealt truly est, let their vvordes speake. *Melanchthon* saith, that God not only permitteth, but also doth al in his creaturs, *vt sicut fateantur, proprium opus Dei fuisse Pauli vocationem &c.* that as they confesse S. Paules vocation to haue been the proper vvork of God, so they may confesse that al vvorkes are Godds proper vvorkes, vvhether they be indifferent, as to eate and drink, which are common to brute beasts, or vvhether they be euil as Dauds aduoutry, Manlius his seueritie tovvards his sonne, seing it is manifest that God doth al not permissiuely, but potently, to vse *Austins* vvords: so that Iudas his tresson, is as properly Gods work as Paules vocation. Yet I vvill not deny but that *Melanchthon* recanted this opiniõ after vvard, as *Prateolus* hath noted. *Caluin* speakes as plainly as hee. *Tergiuersando itaque effugiunt, Dei tantum permissu non autem voluntate hæc fieri. By shifting therfore they escape, vvho say that these* (sinnes) *are done only by Gods permission, and not by his vvil.* And again saith he, *homo iusto Dei impulsu agit quod sibi non licet, man by Gods iust impulsion*, or setting forvvard, *doth*

Melin ep. Ro. apud Prateol. l. 11. verbo Melanc. thon.

Prateol. supra.

Calu. l 1. Inst. c. 18. § 1. Impr. Gen. 1552.

ibid. § 4.

*that vvhich is not lavvful for him to doe.* And yet again: *non nisi sciente atque ita ordinãte Deo, cecidit Adam: not vvithout Gods knovvledg and ordination Adam fel.* And yet more expresly: *Deo autore (peccata) fieri, scriptura pronunciat,* Scriptur pronounceth that God being the Author, sinnes are done. Tel novv *Sotc:* vvhether that it be not al one to say, *God is the Author of sinne,* and to say, *that sinnes are his vvorkes, and as much as good vvorkes, that they are doneby his vvill and ordination* (by which he doth what he doth, his wil being his power) *and impulsion:* that sinnes, *are done God being the Autour:* And then tell me, vvhether *Melanchthon* and *Caluin*, haue not renewed this old hereſie, and you continevved your old vaine of lying? I could adde that *Caluin*, and others, yea almoſt al of you do affirm, that al our good vvorkes are ſinnes, but God is the author of al good vvorks, *ergo* of ſinnes. and ſo you alſo are authors of that old hereſie. But more of this heratter.

l. de æter. na Dei præ deſt. fol. 916.

ibid. fol. 944. Simi. lia habet l. 2. Inſt. c. 4. §. 2 l. 3. ca. 23. §. 8.

Caln. l. 3. Inſt. c. 24. §. 5. 9. 11.

SOTCLIFF.

*VVe doe not ſay vvith Iouinian that al ſinnes are equal &c.*

KELLISON.

HEre our Deanes vvittes vvere gone a vvollegathering: for he anſvvers not in

order to the hereſies vvher vvith I, charged them. and wheras I imputed to his Cõſorts, that with *Heluidius and Iouinia, they make Mariage æqual with virginitie*: he anſwereth chalke for cheeſe, excuſing him ſelfe frõ one hereſie, vvhen he vvas accuſed of another: that is, of making mariage & virginitie æqual, not al ſinnes æqual. yet becauſe he paſſeth this hereſie vvith ſilence, I vvil again propoſe it. That *Heluidius* then & *Iouinian* held this hereſie, S. *Auſtin* and S. *Hierom* are ſufficient vvitneſſes. *Iouinian* (ſaith S. *Auſtin*) *virginitatem etiam Sanctimonialium &c. the virginitie of Nonnes, and the continencie of the manlike ſex, in the Saintes, that haue choſen a ſingle life, he made æqual vvith the merits of chaſt and faithful mariages.* So *that certain holy Virgins in Rome, vvher he taught theſe things are ſayd to haue marryed.* S. *Hierom* vvriting againſt *Heluidius*, imputeth the ſame hereſie vnto him, as alſo to *Iouinian*, in a booke he vvrote againſt him. The ſame hereſie *Luther* hath renewed, auouching, as commonly al the Ghoſpellers do, that *Mariage* is æqual in merit vvith *Virginitie*, And ſo *Sotcliff* that out of order, after vvards, ſaith, *vvee renounce Heluidius, Rhetorius, and al ancient heretikes*, contradicteth him ſelfe, and his Maiſters.

pag. 186 edi. 1. pag. 106. edit. 2.

Aug. l. de her. her. 82.

Hier. l. 1. cõt. Helu. cap. 20. lib. 2. cont. Iou. Luth. l. de vita coniug. & lib. aduerſus cathar.

SOTCLIFFE.

NOr did Hierom vvriting against Vigilantius, allovv prayer to Saints departed, or the merits of Monkerie, or teach as the Papists do of vigils, or lightes set up in Churches at Noone tyme. But suppose he should hold opinions contrarie to the truth, yet are not his vvordes a rule of heresie.

KELLISON.

IN this also Sotc. answereth out of order, and chalke for cheese. for vvheras I sayd that they marrye Priests, and despise Reliques with the same Vigilantius: Sotcliff answereth, nor did Hierom, vvriting against Vigilantius, allovv prayer to sainctes departed &c. But I vvill first bring Sotc. to my assertion vvhich vvas, that vvith Vigilantius, they marrie Priests, and despise Reliques. S. Hierom therfore in his second booke against him saith thus: he is sayd to haue Bishops partakers of his vvickednes, if they be to be called Bishops, which do not ordain deacõs vnles first they marry vvives &c. and a litle after, and vnles they see the vvives of Clerkes great vvith child, and their children crying in their mothers armes, they giue not Christs sacramẽts. Vvhat shal the Churches of the East do? Vvhat shal the Bishops of Ægipt and the Apostolical Seat doe?

pag. 186. edit. 1 pag. 106. edit. 2.

l. 2. cont. Vigil.

vvhich ether take Clerkes virgins, or continent: or if they haue had vviues, they cesse to be husbands. S. Hierom counted this an heresie cõtrarie to the opinion of the Eastern and Romain Church, for as yet the Grecian Priests nether maryed nor vsed vviues. Vvhether Sot: and his ministers aggree in this vvith *Vigilantius*, let the world, yea their wiues speake.

aboue ch. 2. Yea let *Sotc:* speake, vvho as vve haue seen

Hier. l. 1. cont. Vigil. condemneth Papists for forbidding mariage to Preists. That *Vigilantius* despised Reliques, the same *saint Hierom* vvitnesseth in his first booke against him: saying *that Vigilantius* called him and al other Christians *Cinerarios* for vvorshipping reliques. *Saint Hierom* answereth, *vve honour reliques of Martyrs, that vve may adore him whose martyres they vvere.* Vvhether *Sotcliff* and his ministers do not condẽne reliques, let the vvorld speake, and then let him tel vs vvhether he standes not vvith *Vigilantius* against *saint Hierom*, and so hath renevved his heresie? Touching *Sot.* assertion that *saint Hierom allowed not prayer to Saintes nor merits of monkerie* (to vse *Sotcliffs* vvordes) *nor vigils nor lightes*, it is a loud lye of *Sottliffe*. For *S. Hierom* vvriting S. *Paulaes*

Hier. in Epitaph. Paul. life & death, in the end prayeth vnto her in these vvordes: *Far vvel ô Paula, and help the*

*old age of thy vvorshipper vvith thy prayers: thy faith and good workes do linke the to Christe, being present, thou shalt more easilie impetrate, vvhat thou askest*: And in his 2. booke against *Vigilantius* thus he saith, *dicis in libello tuo &c. thou sayst in thy litle booke, that vvhileste Vvee liue vvee may pray for one another, but after vve are dead: no mans prayer is to be hard for another. S. Hierom* answereth *si Apostoli & Martyres &c. If the Apostles and Martyrs yet in this body, or life, can pray for the rest, vvhen they must as yet be sollicitous for them selues: hovv much more after their crovvnes, Victories, and Triumphes?* And thē exēplifying in *Moyses* and *S. Stephen*, who in this life prayed for others, he sayth, *postquam cum Christo esse cœperint, minus valebunt? after thy haue begun to be with Christ, shal they be lesse able?* Touching the merits of Monastical life, S. *Hierom* in that Epistle vvhich goeth vnder the name *of Paula and Eustochium, to Marcella the noble vvidow*, pronounceth thus *Certe flos &c. Trulie the queere of Monkes and virgins, is a certain flovver, and most pretious stone amongest* the *Ecclesiastical ornaments*. And in his 2. booke against *Vigilantius*, he recordeth hovv that heretike carped at this life, and sayd, that if al be shut vp in Monasteries, *who shal do the office in the Church, vvho shal exhort*

Exod. 32. Act. 7.

sinners? But S. *Hierom* defendeth that life against him, and prayseth it a 1000. tymes. And he him selfe was a monke, and an authour of many Monasteries. *Vigils* also and *lights*, he defendeth eagerly against *Vigilantius*; for writing to *Riparius*, he saith: *Nam quod dicis eum vigilias execrari, fecit & hoc contra vocabulum suum vt velit dormire Vigilantius, & non audiat salvatorem dicentem, sic non potuisti vna hora vigilare mecum, for whereas thou sayest, that he detesteth vigils, that also is against his name, that Vigilantius may sleep, and not hear our Sauiour saying: so, couldst thou not watch one houver with mee?* And in his 2. booke against *Vigilantius*, he defendeth the vse of *waxe candels*, and lights euen in the day, to signifie spiritual ioye. and he addeth, that in *all the Churches of the East*, when the Ghospel is read, *candles are light, not to dispers darcknes, but to signifie ioye.*

Ep. ad Ripar. seu. l. 2. cont. Vigil.

Mat. 26.

SOTCLIFE.

*THe Councel of Nice allowed a certain reuerence done to Images but nothing so much as they now vse to giue to them &c.*

KELLISON.

VVhat reuerence that Councel bare to Images, let *Photius*, one of the Coun-

cel, speake: *This sacred and Great Councel* (saith he) *by a diuine and common sentence condemned the lately discouered and barbarouse heresie, which vvas begotten of execrable and vvicked men, together vvith the Authors. For these vnhappie men* (Image breakers) *in vvords confessing that they do not curse Christe our true God, in deeds do heap vp against him al maledictions and sauciues of tongue: for the Image of Christ vvhich is to be adored, by vvhich the errour of Idols is excluded, they haue called an Idol, and haue vsed it vvith al ignominies, and drawing it by the publique vvayes, treading it vvith their feete, haue cast it into the fier. Vvhence a most greuous vvarr vvas stirred vp against Christe and his sanctes. For it is manifest to al, that that honour giuen to images, redoundeth to them vvhom they represent.* Here vvee see those infamous Image-breakers. *Leo Isauricus, Constantinus Copronymus*, his sonne, so surnamed for his ominous beraying of the fonte, *Leo Armenus, Michael Balbus, Theophilus*, and their followers, condemned for barbarous heretikes, and bastard Christians by the 2. Councel of Nice called the 7. Generall Councel, consisting of 350 Bishops. And vvhy? forsooth for denying vvorship to Images, and for calling them idols, and for breaking and defacing them, for which they

Photius apud Praeol. v. Iconomachi.

Cedren. Paul. diac. Zonar. Sand. li. 1. cap. vlt. de Imag. Cation. li. 3. Chron. an. 719.

are called *Iconoclasts* and *Iconomachi*, that is Image breakers, & fighters against Images. And this they warre against Images *Photius* calleth, warre against Christ and his saintes. Whether now our new ghospellers haue not renewed this heresie and warre against Images, and whether these barbarous heretikes are not born again in our reformers, as *Euphorbus* in *Pithagoras*: I report me to their warre which they haue made against Images in *Ingland*, *Fraunce*, and *Flaunders*, and to their bookes and pulpits, which sound nothing more, then that Images of Christe & his saintes are idols. And therfore *D. Remolds* a principal *Iconomachus*, entitleth his booke which he wrote against Images, *de Romanæ Ecclesiæ Idololatria*, and calleth the Image of Christe (which, the alleaged Councel calleth *adorandam*) an idol, if it be adored, or worshipped: wth speech the same Councel expressely condemneth. But *Sotc.* saith that the 2. *Councel* of *Nice* allowed not so much honour to Images as Papists doe. Let the Councels wordes then be hard: *The Councel*, saith *Photius*, *iudged and confirmed by al suffrages, that the Image of Christe our true God, out of the traditions of the Apostle and holy fathers* (see how ancient wor-

Syn. 7. act. 5. & 7.

ſhip of Images is) *is to be adored and vvorſhipped to the honour and reuerence of him vvhom th'Image repreſenteth.* And a litle after, the fathers of that Councel ſay, *vve vvorſhipping and adoring the Image of Chriſte, his croſſe and the marke of his croſſe, do not conclude the honour and adoration in them but do direct it to him; vvho for the incredible riches of his loue tovvards vs, vvas made man and ſuffered for vs a contumelious death.*

And a litle after *Photius* ſaith: *Vvherfore that diuine and holy congregation of bleſſed and ſacred men, decreed and confirmed by the decrees of common Oracles, that not only the Image of Chriſte, as vve haue ſayed, but alſo of the moſt immaculate and alvvayes virgin Marie our lady and Mother of God, and the holy Images of al ſaintes, according to the excellẽcie of the Exemplairs, are to be vvorſhipped and adored.* Vvhere vvee ſee that this *Councel* ſaith, that the Image is to bee vvorſhipped vvith the ſame honour vvith which Chriſte or the ſainte is vvorſhipped, but vvith this difference, that Chriſte or the ſaint is vvorſhipped for him ſelfe, the Image for Chriſte or the ſaint. And therfore the Councel ſaith, that vve conclude not the vvorſhip of Chriſtes Image and croſſe in thoſe things, but do direct it to Chriſte him

selfe. And no more honour doe, or can Catholikes giue to Images. And so if those fathers were no idolatours, neither are wee, and if they condemned those heretikes for denying this worship to Images, they condēne also our Ghospellers, whoe deny this worship. Whereas *Sotcliff* addeth, that the Councel of Francford, reproued this Councel, I answer that that Councel was not Generall, neither *Adrian* nor his legates being present, and yet that Councel also cōmaunded Images to be honoured, and condemned only the Nicen Councel, bicause it was falsely informed, that that Councel gaue to Images diuine honour. Hence I inferre that the Ghospellers haue renewed the heresie of the Image breakers, bicause they not only deny them to be honoured, but also do deform, deface, breake, and burne them, as *Carolstadius* Luthers scholler cast Images out of the Churches, which fact *Luther* allowed, though he found fault bicause he did it without his licence. Zuinglius also made most furious warre against Images, as *Cocleus* describeth. And the Caluinists who brake the glazen windowes, and made such Hauock of Images in *S. Paules* Church in *Lodō*, in S, *Medards* Church in *Paris*, in the great Church

Bel. to. 1. l. de Imagin. c. 14.

12 Cocl. in Actis Luth. an. 1522.

12 Cocl. an 1516. Ex Del Rio. l. 3. disquis. Magic. pa. 1. 47. sect. 1.

Church in *Antwerp*, in *Rhemond*, and *Lions*, yet they spared the deuils Imago, as the Image of their Maister. As Hierom of Prague defiled vvith ordures the Image of Christe, and yet honoured Vvicleph Image & crowned it with a diademe. And so they haue renevved the heresie of Image-breakers, & they succeed not only to them but also to *Claudius Taurinensis*, *Hierom* of *Prague*, *Vvicleph*, yea *Mahomet*, vvho in the Alcoran chap. 19. condemneth Images, yea to the Iewes, vvho in their *Talmud*, cal the Church of Christians, the hovvses of Idolatrie, by reason of Images.

ex Cod. l. 3. hist. mist. Hussit.

Ord. 2. tract. 1. d. 2.

SOTCLIFF.

*Ærius vvas reputed an heretike for Arrianisme and not for finding fauls vvith superstitious oblations for the dead.*

KELLISON.

I Sayd that vvhich *Ærius* they denye the sacrifice, to vvit for the dead. *Sotcliff* answereth that *Arius*, vvas not counted an heretike for this. But of this let *Epiphanius* be iudge. *Ærius* (saith he) vvas vvholly an Arrian, for he thought no otherwise thē *Arius*, and yet, he serched further then the opiniōs

Aug. hær 53. Epiph hær. 75. Prateol. v. Æriani.

of *Arius*. And then setting dovvn his heresies, he saith he contemned the fastes of the Church, made Bishops and Priests æqual, and denyed prayers and the oblatiõ, for the dead. To answer as *Sotcliff* doth in his vain chalenge, that *Arius*, vvas condemned only for disallovving the naming of the dead, is to salue the matter vvith an vntruth, bicause S. *Austin* and *S. Epiphanius* in the alleaged places do expressely say that he denyed prayer and oblations for the dead. And so they haue renevved *Arius* heresies in denying prayer and sacrifice for the dead.

Supra.

SOTCLIFF.

*FInally vve anathematize, the heresies, of the Simonians, Menandrians and others (vvhom he ridiculously surmiseth to haue been condemned for denying the real presence) the Messalians, and Caians (vvhom he imagineth to haue been accounted heretikes for denying the Sacraments to contein grace as the Papists hold it) of the Nouatians, that denyed repentaunce to publike sinners, of the Gnosticks, Manichees, and Encratites (vvhom he ignorantly surmiseth to haue been condemned for denying Mariage to be a Sacrament) of Heluidius, &c.*

KELLISON.

HEre wee see that he cleareth him selfe by a sole and bare denial. But vvheras he saith, that I ridiculously surmise that the *Simonians*, and *Menandrians* vvere counted heretikes for denying the real presence, he is a *ridiculum caput*, in denying so open a truth, to make him selfe so manifest a lyer. Bicause *S. Ignatius* affirmeth it in these vvordes: *Eucharistias & oblationes non admittunt &c. They admit not Eucharists and oblations, bicause they confesse not the Eucharist to bee the flesh of our Sauiour Iesus Christe.* Vvhere wee see that these heretikes denyed the *Eucharist*, bicause they denyed it to be the flesh of our Sauiour, and this they denyed also, bicause they denyed Christ to haue a true body. As concerning the *Messalians*, othervvise called *Euchytæ* and *Caians*, *Theodoretus* (Vvhose, yea, is better then *Sotcliffes* Nay) speaking of these heretikes sayth: *dicunt Baptismum non auferre peccata nec conferre gratiam, they say baptism taketh not avvay sinnes nor giueth grace, but that this is done by continual prayer.* S. *Damascen* sayth, *negant &c. they deny that the participation of the diuine mysteries doth expiate the filthes of the soule: they say that in the ordinations of Clerkes the holy Ghost is not receiued.* And seing that *Luther*, and *Caluin*, and *Melanchthon*, and *Zuinglius*, af-

Ign. ep. ad Smyrn. apud Theod. Dial. 3.

Theod. l. 4. hæret. Fab.

Dam. hær. 80. Sic Praecol. v. Euthusiast. Luth.

firm also that the Sacraments are no causes of *Grace*, it followeth that they haue renewed their heresie. The *Caians* also if vve believe *Tertulian lib. de Bapt. c. 1.* were counted heretikes for denying Baptisme to regenerate vs and to remitt our sinnes. And therfore as *Tertulia* calleth them vipers, who can not brooke vvater, sovvould hee haue called these nevv *Caians*. And as he sayed then that Christians are Fishes, taking their spiritual natiuitie from vvater, so say vvee. That the *Nouatians* denyed, the Sacrament of Pœnaunce, S. *Ciprian*, *Cornelius Pope*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Gregorie Nazianzen*, *Nicephorus*, *Sozomen*, *Socrates*, *Epiphanius*, and S. *Austin* do affirme; & although some say they rooke avvay also priuat, and internal repentaunce: yet sure it is, if these Fathers be credited, that they denyed the Sacrament of Pœnaunce, and the Priests absolution, and exhorted sinners to internal repentaunce. To these *Luther* subscribeth *lib. de capt. Bab. cap. de Bapt.* accusing S. *Hierom* for calling this *Sacrament* the second table after shipvvrack, and auouching that this Sacrament vvantes a visible signe instituted by Christe. *Melancthon* saith *that ther is no other sacrament of Pœnaunce then Baptisme.* *Calvin* saith that it is an imposture and vvicked

l. captiu. c. de Bapt. Calu li. 4. Inst. c. 14. §. 23. & in Act. 7 sect. 21. Mel. in loc. 1512 c. de sigo. l. de Bapt. Cip. ep. 52. Corn. ep. 1 to. 1. conc. Ambr. l. 2. de pœn. c. 12. l. 9. c. 2 Naz. orat. 29 Niceph. li 11. c. 14. Zoz. l. 1. c. 21 Soc. l. 1. c. 7. Epiph. her. 59. Aug. her. 38.

Melanct. in loc. 1512. Cal. li 4. c. 9 §. 17.

deuise to cal *Pœnaunce a Sacrament, and the 2. Table after Shipwrack.* And he giues the reason, *bicause Baptism is a sign of remission euen of future sinnes,* whence followeth, that vve need no pœnaunce after Baptism, yea that vvee need not care for sinnes cõmitted after Baptism, bicause Baptisme signifieth that they are already remitted, that is not imputed. That the *Gnosticks, Encratites,* and *Manichies,* denyed *Matrimonie* to be a *Sacrament,* and vvere therfore counted heretikes (though *Sotel,* saith I do ignorauntly surmise it) none but a *Sot.* can denye it, or surmise othervvise. For *Saturninus* vvho liued in the same tyme that *Carpocras,* the father of the *Gnosticks,* did, sayd that *to marrie was of Satã. the Gnosticks liberorum generationem auersantur:* one *Severus,* sayd that they that had to do vvith a woman did fulfil the deuils worke, bicause she is his handivvork. *Tatianus* the father of the *Encratites,* sayd *Mariage is of the deuil:* The *Manichees,* sayd the same. And vvho hearing them condẽne Mariage as abominable, and the work of the deuil, can surmise otherwise thẽ that they also must needes deny it to be a sacrament? And seing that *Calvin,* saith mariage is no more a sacrament, then tillage of the ground, and al of them deny it to bee a

Ex Sand. l. 7. her. 14. Iren. l. 1. c. 21. 31. Cle. Alex. li. 3. Strom. Epipha. & Theod. in eorũ her. Nicet. l. 4. orth fidei. her. 17. Theod. li. 1. heret. Fab.

l. 4. Inst. c. 19. § 24.

Aug. li. de bono conjug. c. 7. 18 Ide fide & oper. c. 7 Chrys ho. 36 in Gen. Ign. ep. 11. Euar. ep. 1. Tertull. li. præsc. c. 4. Pamel. in An. 11. 248. Ex Tho. Vvald. to. 2. de sacra. cap. 109. Luth. li. capt. Bab. c. de Ord. Calu. in Antid. sess. 7. can. 9. Innoc. ep. Maiores. de Bapt. in art. Vvicle. in Decreto vnion. Trid. Sess. 7. can. 9. Ex Aug. l. 1. cont. ep. Pel. c. 10. Luth. lcõt. Cocl. Cal. Defens. 2. cõt. Vvest phal. li. 1. Inst. c. 16 §. 26. li. 4. c. 16.

sacrament: They haue shaken handes with those heretikes, and haue broken frendship vvith S. *Austin*, and *S. Chrisostome*, vvho calle it expressely a *sacrament*, yea vvith S. *Ignatius* and S. *Euarist*, vvho affirm it to haue been celebrated in the Church and blessed like a *sacrament*: Vvhich *Tertulian* also affirmeth, and calleth it a sacrament & an happy sacrament, and that very often tymes, as *Pamelius* hath noted. I had charged them also that vvith *Vvicleph l. 4. Trial.* they deny *Caracters* in *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, and *Order*, to vvhich *Sotcliff* answereth not, knowing that *Luther*, and *Caluin* reiect and contemne them, and so haue renewed also that heresie, condēned by *Innocentius* the third, *Thomas Vvaldensis*, the councels of *Constance*, *Florence*, and *Trent*. I affirmed also that vvith *Pelagius* they deny Baptism: and to this *Sotcliff* answers not, but only that hee renounceth *Pelagius*. But certes in this he iumpeth with him. For as *Pelagius*, sayd that Baptism vvas not necessarie to saluatiō, so doth *Martin Luther* in effect, bicause he saith children beleeue and that faith only iustifieth them. And *Caluin* expressely teacheth that the children of faithful Parentes are saued vvithout Baptisme, and addeth that it is not to be giuen to

the Reprobate and children of Infidels, and consequently maketh it altogether vnnecessarie. I had accused them also to haue reiected free vvil vvith the Manichees, for so *Luther* and *Caluin* do in expresse termes. But *Sotcliff* hath no excuse for them. I had accused them that they hold only faith to iustifie with *Simon Magus*, and *Eunomius*: but *Sotcliff* saith nothing to it, I shal say more heraftet. I might haue added that they make Christe ignorant vvith the *Gnostickes*: for so *Luther* and *Caluin* doe: that vvith the *Nouatians*, and *Donatists*, they despise *Chrisme* and *Cõfirmatiõ*, that vvith the *Armenians*, they put no water vvith their vvine in their *Supper*, vvith *Beguards*, and *Beguines*, they exempt the faithful or iuste from humain lavves: And vvith *Rhetorius*, they imbrace almost al former heresies. Out of this I inferr tvvoe conclusions. The first shalbe that the *Apologie* of *Ingland*, and *D. Humphred* in *Iewels* life, and *Sotcliff* in this chapter, do lye lovvdly in saying that they reiect al ancient heresies recounted by *Epiphanius* and *S. Austine*: for most of these heresies, I haue rehearsed out of thẽ. The 2. conclusion is that, vvhich *Sotcliff* shal neuer be able to answver: to vvit, that (though he cal me heretike *pag.* 42. *lin.* 10.)

Ex Hiero. Dial. cont. Pel. Aug. heref. 70. Luth. ar 36 Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 23.

ex Iren. l. 1. c. 17. Luth. Conc. Natiu. Dñi. Cal. in c. 24. Mat. ex Theod. l. 3 her fab. ex Opt. Male. l. 2. & Aug. her. 69. ex Guidon ex Clem. ad nostrũ de heres. Par. 2. pag. 118

1. Conclusion.

1. Conclusion.

he and his Ministers are heretikes in the highest degree, and more then any of the ancient heretikes. For if they for seuerall heresies vvere iustly condemned for heretikes, much more may he and his Ministers, vvho haue taked hel, to take them al togeither.

## The somme of the fift chapter.

THe Church of Christe being once planted by him and his Apostles, and it being so stable, that it can neuer be ouerthrovvn, so conspicuous and eminent, that it can neuer be hidden, as is proued: That Church now must be the true Church, vvhich can shevv a continual succession from that primitiue Church: that must be a bastardly Church, and they heretikes, vvho can not shevv their pedegree from this stocke. And therfore Tertulian Ireneus, Optatus, S. Austin, by me alleaged, do allege a succession of Popes to their tymes, and therby proue their ovvn Church Apostolical, heretikes synagogues Apostatical. The Catholikes of this tyme do shevv the like succession, and so are right Christians: the Reformers can not, and so are bastardly Christians, and heretikes.

Tertoll. 3. præscr. c. 30. 31. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Opt. l. 2. cõt. Don. Donat. August. ep. 165. li. cont. epist. fund. c. 4. l. de vtilit. cred. c. 17. & in Psal. cont. part. Donat.

*Sotcliffes answer, vvith the Refutation.*

Sotc. pag. 10.

A Simple mark, if vve dovvel consider. And vvhy good Sir? For neither

*the beginning* (saith he) *of the vvorld, nor in the time of Aaron, vvas ther any succession of known Priests in the vvorld. likevvise nether our Saujour Christe nor Peter did succeed the Priests of the lavv.* And are you so simple Sir Sotcliff that you can not see this your simplicitie? do you not know that the first lord of a lordship or familie, can not proue his title or Gentrie by succession, but by the Kings donation or some other title, and yet his successours must proue their title by succession, else they vvill be put beside their lordship and Gentrie? vvherfore *Aaron* being the first ordinarie high Priest of the old lavv, Christe of the new, & *S. Peter* being Christes first vicair (for successor he hath none) our minister is very simple to call succession *a simple marke*, bicause in them it was not necessarie: And as vvel he might deem our learned and vvise Prince K. Iames, simple, for prouing his title to the crovvn by succession to Henrie the 8. by his sisters side, vvhose children vvere to succeed to the crovvn, after King Henries noble issue fayled.

But to confesse (saith *Sotc.* as he is loth to doe, bicause this confession hanges him) *succession to be a marck of the Church, and vve not*

*of succession a mark of an heretike, yet would this one propertie of heretikes, much blemish the Romain Sea.* vvhy I pray you? *For nether* (saith he) *are the Popes, Bishops, or Peters Successors, nor can the Papists derive their doctrine of the Popes vniuersal power, of his twoe swords, and his espousals vvith the Church, of his Indulgences, of carnal eating, and Champing Christes flesh &c.* Fy for shame, bring you alvvayes the same and that vvhich so often hath been answered? And vvill you stil play *vvill Sommer*, in striking vvhen you should vvard a blovve? I haue proued that you succeed not the Church plãted by the Apostles, bicause you can shevv noe line of your succession, nor catalogue of your Kinges, and Bishops, nor no monuments of your Churches: and you do not so much as endeuour, to shevv your succession. And no meruail; because aboue in your first chapter, you could bring it noe higher, then *Luther* in *Germanie*, *Farel* in *France*, *Cranmer* in *England*, and *Knox* in *Scotland*. but you seek to disproue ours, vvhen you should proue your ovvn. And hovv disproue you our succession to the primatiue Church? by particuler doctrines of the *Popes Supremacie*, the *real presence*, *Indulgences*, *transubstantiation*, *communion vnder one kind*, &c.

But theſe pointes partly are already proued partlye ſhal bee proued, euery one to be as ancient as th' Apoſtles: and novve vvee take not of particuler points of doctrine but of the ſucceſſion of the vvholl Church and paſtors. Thē hee ſeekes to proue the ſucceſſion of his Church from the Apoſtles, bicauſe they teach conformably to the Apoſtles vvritinges, and hee diſprovves ours, bicauſe vvee teach contrarie to *the Apoſtles yea and Apoſtolical men.* but thus hee makes the letter of ſcripture, vvith a volūtary meaning the rule and iudge of faith, & thus hee giues ſcope to all heretickes, to proue that their doctrine is Apoſtolicall, and deſcended by ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, for they alſo can ſay and haue euer ſayed, that they teach conformably to the Apoſtles vvritings: but the fathers by mee alleaged, content not them ſelues vvith this ſucceſſion, yea *Tertulian* refuſeth it, in that hee refuſeth to diſpute vvith heretickes by bare ſcripture, and therfore they vrge the heretickes to ſhevv the Biſhops to vvhom they ſucceeded, the diſcipline and practiſe of their Church, and the reception of their faith and doctrine in the vvorld before their preaching: and this alſo I require of *Sotcliff*, els

pag. 36. 37.

hee hath not shewed his descent and succession from the Apostles.

3. But now it is a sporte to see howe *Sotel*: to proue him selfe heire to the Apostles, alleageth these wordes of *Tertulian*,

lib. præscr. *Ego sum hæres Apostolorum, sicut cauerunt testamento suo, sicut fidei commiserunt, sicut adiurauerunt, ita teneo: I am the heir of the Apostles &c.* You maister Minister the heir of the Apostles? do these wordes agree to you? yea saith hee, bicause I teache, conformablye to their epistles and Ghospells. no no Sir Sotel: the next wordes of *Tertulian* are for you. *Vos exheredauerunt semper & abdicauerunt vt extraneos, vt inimicos. The Apostles haue allway disherited you and haue reiected you as strangers, as enemies.* Yet to deale liberally with you: bring the same proofe that *Tertulian* doth to proue him selfe the heir of the Apostles, and I will giue you the inheretaunce; yea I will deale more liberally: if you can bringe better or other proofes, then the heretickes of *Tertulians* tyme: you shal bee the Apostles heires: and if I can not proue my selfe the heir of the Apostles by the same arguments, which *Tertulian* vsed, I renounce all right to the inheretaunce of Scripture, Church, and faith, bequeathed by the Apo-

ſtles after Chriſt, vnto their true and lavvfull heires, and children. Hovv then did thoſe heretickes, againſt vvhō hee vvriteth, proue themſelues heires to the Apoſtles? by ſcriptures only. for, ſayeth *Tertullian*, *they deale out of ſcripture, and they perſvvade out of ſcripture, and by this boldnes they moue manie.* yet *Tertullian* counteth not this a ſufficient proofe, bicauſe they vvill corrupt ſcripturs by addition or detraction, or peruert them by euill expoſition. And ſo to diſpute vvith them by ſcripture, (ſayeth hee) is good for nothing, *but to turne our ſtomacke or our braine vvith contention: and ether there is no victorie to be hoped for ouer heretickes by ſcripture, or very vncertaine* of vvhich hee giues yet an other reaſon, bicauſe ſuche is the fecunditie of the diuine letters, that heretickes cā eaſelye out of them excogitate hereſies. And hovv did *Tertullian* proue him ſelfe the heir of the Apoſtles, and the heretickes of his tyme to bee baſtardes or falſe pretenders? by tvvoe vvayes: firſt by poſſeſſion and preſcription; and therfore to proue him ſelfe right heire to the ſcriptures deliuered by the Apoſtles, hee demaunded of *Marcion* and *Valentinus vvho they are? from vvhence they come? and vvhat they do in his grounde?* to vvit ſcripture,

li. præſc. c. 17.

c. 19.

c. 39.

HOVVTert. proued him ſelf heir to th' Apoſtles.

c. 37.

myne, saith hee, is the possession, what do you feeding and sowing in my ground at your pleasure? mine is the possessiõ, of olde tyme I possessed, first I possesse. I haue the sure originals frõ the authors, to whõ the thing pertayned: I am the heir of the Apostles &c. The same say I to our reformers: vvee Catholicks euen from the Apostles haue had possession of scripture and the Church: you neuer had till *Luther*: yea *Luther* tooke the scriptures of vs though against our vvills, and if vvee had not kept them, hee had not found them extaunt: & as in vs the Church was cõserued, so wee had possessiõ of it, you nether had, nor could, bicause before *Luther*, you had no Church, as aboue is proued. Secõdly hee proued him selfe the heir of the Apostles by succession, as in diuers places of that book is manifest, let the heretickes (saith hee) *shevv vs the origin and beginning of their Churches, let them vnfold the order of their Bishops so running on by succession from the beginning, that their first Bishop haue for his predecessour some of the Apostles or Apostolicall men. For thus* (saith hee) *the Apostolical Churches census suos deferunt, do shevv their estimations, and valuations*: as hee exemplifieth in the Church of the *Smyrneans, vvhich had Policarp placed by* S. *Ihon: and of the Romans, which haue*

Possession proueth Catho. to bee heires to the Apostles.

aboue fol. 41. pag. 2.

Clement ordained by S. Peter. And to this (saith hee) hereticks shall bee vrged of other Churches, vvho though they can shevv no Apostle nor Apostolicall man, (that is vvho vvas placed by an Apostle in his, seat) yet they cõspiring in the same faith are counted no leß Apostolical, for the consanguinitie of doctrine. And thus also Catholicks proue them selues heires of the Apostles, bicause ether they shevv a continual succession of Bishops euen to the Apostles, as the Romain Church can do, or to their first founder, vvho vvas sent by him that succeeded to the Apostles and conspired in doctrine vvith that Church, vvhich is descended from the Apostles, as the Church of Ingland could do before *Cranmer*, bicause shee could shevv a succession of her Bishops euen from S. Austin the monk, her first Archbishop, who also conuerted her from paganism to Christianitie, and vvho deliuered her that doctrine, vvhich vvas the same that all the Church taught, and euer had taught euen from the Apostles: and so thus also Catholicks do proue them selues the heires of the Apostles, and their doctrine to bee Apostolicall: bicause by succession their pastours and doctrine is descended from the Apostles. But nether thus can *Sotcliff* proue

Succession proues Ca. heires to the Apostles.

Sotcl. no heire to th' Apostles.

himselfe the heire of the Apostles, bicause,
aboue fo. 33. pag. 1. as vvee haue seene aboue, hee can bring nei-
ther his Church, nor his ministers any hig-
her, then *Luther* in *Germanie*, *Zuel* in *Fraunce*,
*Cranmer* in *England*, and *Knox* in *Scotland*:
and before these, there vvas neuer heard,
seen, or felt, any such Church, and minis-
trie, as now vv theirs is.

4. The heretick of this tyme hath fovvn
The heretikes first Shift. shifts to auoid this argument of Succession:
but yet very pore ones: first hee sayth that
they succeed the Apostles, and that their
doctrine is Apostolical, bicause they teach
conformably to scriptures: and this is also
*Sotcliffs* shift, vvho pag: 41. seeks to proue
out of *Tertulian*, that it is sufficient to shevv
conformitie of doctrine to scripture, vvith-
out succession: but this shift vvill not serue
their turn, bicause, so euery heretick may
proue his doctrine Apostolical. True it is
that *Tertulian* confesseth, and it can not bee
denyed, that they that teach conformably
to the Apostles, haue Apostolical doctrine:
but this is as obscure, as scripture, and there-
fore hee refuseth to make the trial of this
cõformitie, by bare scripture. True it is also,
that hee calleth them Apostolical, vvho cõ-
spire in doctrine vvith the Apostles, and
teach

teach as they preached, but yet he referreth vs to the Churches plãted by the Apostles, to knovv vvhat the Apostles taught: and vvhat their Churches taught, hee vvil haue vs to learn by succession. For saith hee, the Apostles haue planted faith and Churches in al nations, *a quibus traducem fidei & semina doctrinæ, cæteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt, & quotidie mutuantur, vt Ecclesiæ fiant: per hoc & ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, vt soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum.* from vvhich other Churches haue borrovved, & daily do borrow the trayne of faith, and the seeds of doctrine, that they may bee Churches, and by this they also are counted Apostolical, as offsprings of the Apostolical Churches. And again hee saith, vvee must receiue no other doctrine, then that vvhich the Apostles preached, bicause Christ reuealed all to them: but hee vvill not haue vs to iudge vvhat they preached, by the bare letter, bicause scripture is obscure and interpreteth not it selfe, but, saith hee, *quid prædicauerint, quid illis Christus reuelauerit, & hic præscribam non aliter probari debere, nisi per eosdem Ecclesias, &c.* vvhat they preached, that is vvhat Christ reuealed vnto them, heere I vvill prescribe, that it ought not othervvise to be proued, but by the same Churches: So that it is not sufficiẽt to alleadge lib. præscr.

Scripture in a voluntary sense, to proue doctrine Apostolical, for so euery heretike can do, and hath done, but it is necessary also, to shew that the doctrine is conformable to Apostolical and ancient Churches, which with the Apostles writings, receued also the meaning of them, and the practise also of this faith. And this *Sotc.* can not shew, because endeuouring to fetch his pedegree from the Apostles, hee can ascend no higher thē to *Luther* in Germanie, *Farel* in Fraunce, *Cranmer* in Ingland.

above fol. 33. pag. 1.

His second shift.

§. The second euasion, is to say, that they succeed th'Apostles by interruptiō of many hundred yeares, for, say they, that church was pure for some two or 3. hundred yeares, and that Church in that puritie, was ours: but after it degenerated, till *Luther* restored it again to the auncient splendour. Wherfor the *Magdeburgians* say, that the Church in *Luthers* tyme, answered the Church of the Apostles tyme: And *Sotcliff* saith, that they do not only cōmunicate in matters of faith with the Apostles, but also with the ancient Bishops of *Hierusalem*, *Antioche*, and *Rome*, almost for a thousand yeares. But this is but a souldiers bragg. for if hee run ouer al the Ecclesiastical histories, and al auncient

præfa. in cent. 3.

Sot. pa. 41

vvritings, hee shall neuer fynd any sign of such a Church or ministerie, as novv they haue: yea euen from the beginning, hee shal finde vse of Images, *prayer to Saynts*, and for *the dead, Sacrifice, Religious life, vnmarried Priests*, as partly I haue proued, partly shal proue. The Churches also and Monasteries yet extaũt, some aboue a thousand yeares old, the catalogues of Bishops and Kings, the confessions of Martyrs to bee seen in their liues, the vvritings and liues of the most ancient Doctours of the Church, vvho many of thẽ vvere monks (as *Dionisius* the first Pope of that name, and vvho liued in the yeare 260, and before him *Telesphorus*, vvho before hee vvas Pope, was an Anachorit) the Hierarchie and gouernment of the Church, the Ecclesiastical histories, do al beare vvitnes, that our Church only florished, and that yours vvas not as yet in *rerum natura*: yea the conuersion euen of our particuler countrie (as I shal proue in my refutation of *Sotcliffs Appendix*, to this booke and fourth marke) argueth that only our Religion and Church florished in S. *Gregories* tyme, and before also: because nether S. *Gregorie* nor any of his predecessours, were noted then to bring in any nevv Religion, but to persevere in

ex Democha. de Sacrif. Missæ to. 2. Petr. Opmersen. in Cat. Ex Euseb. in Chron. & Damaso in vit. Põt.

Cent. 1. l. 1. c. 10. pag. 369 pa. 54 & li. 2. c. 7. pag. 145. & li. 1. ca. 10. præfa. cet. 2 & cap 1. Ignat. ep. ad Smyrn. [illegible] fol. 4. [illegible]

that they had receiued by Tradition, from the beginning. Hence it is that the *Magdeburgians* euen in the first, second, and third age after Christe, are enforced to reiect many things vvhich they fynde in those ages repugnant to their doctrine: as *Exequies, vowes, holy vessels, vnmarried Priests, voluntarie powerte and chastitie, penaunce, merit, good vvorks, free vvill, satisfaction, the immolation of the sacrifice, fast of lent*, and *Ember vveeks*, called *quatuor tempora*. And they haue no vvay to auoyd this antiquitie, but by denying the bookes or by affirming, that then doctrin in faith declined.

6. But if Sotc. vvil needs haue it graunted that the Apostles planted his Church, and that consequently he and his Church, are Apostolical: I demaund, vvhether those first Christians conuerted by the Apostles, vvere *Lutheranes*, or *Zuinglians*, or *Caluinistes*? For these are the principal Sectes of this Reformed Church, and are admitted by Sotcl. in the next chapter for brethren. If he say *Zuinglians*, or *Caluinistes*: the *Lutheranes*, yea *Luther* him selfe, vvil oppose: vvho in the yeare before his death pronounced this anathem against them: *Hæreticos serio cẽsemus &c. vve esteem serionsly and in good sadnes, al Zuin-*

Luth. thes. 17. ann. 1545.

glians and Sacramentaries, heretikes and alienes from the Church of God. If he say they vvere Lutheranes: Beza, will say he lyeth in the throate: for he calles the Lutheranes, Eutichians, and Nestorians: and Caluinistes (as Hunnius reporteth) do count Lutheranes, no better then Manichees, Marcionists, and Monothelites. Certes to exẽplifie in the reformed Church of Caluin, if it had been plãted by the Apostles, Caluins Cene, or Communion booke, must haue been the Liturgie, of some Apostle: and yet in al the Apostles Liturgies, there is mention of a Sacrifice of Christs body in the Masse, of prayer for the dead, and such like things, vvhich haue no cõmunication vvith Caluins Communion: and Illyricus if he may be beleeued, assureth vs, that Caluinistarum liturgia non vno sacrilegio vitiata est &c. the Caluinists liturgie is vitiated not vvith one only sacrilege, and (out alas) hath enwrapped innumerable soules in æternal perdition. The like censure Conradus giueth of it, and the Puritanes, of Inglãd make noe better esteeme of the Communion booke of England. So that nether Lutheranisme, nor Caluinisme, nor Zuinglianisme, vvas preached by the Apostles: much lesse Anabaptisme, as therefore sayd 3. sectes confesse, and Soto. him selfe auoucheth. If Soto,

Bez. in colloq. Mom. pelg. Hun. in Papistmis.

Illyr. in defens. Confess. Aug. c. 17.

Conr. l. 3. Theol. Calu. Admonit. ad Pariam.

Soto. pag. 42.

answer that the Apostles preached and planted al the afore sayd 3. or 4. sectes: he must graunt, that they preached and taught not only *contraries*, but also contradictories, as appeareth by the iarres and discords of the sayd sectes, vvhich are rehearsed in the next chapter: and so though Catholikes hold their peace, the reformed Church of England vvilbe condemned for Apostatical, and in no vvise vvill bee receued for Apostolical.

3. shift. 7. A third euasion, by vvhich they seeke to auoid the argument grounded in succession, is, that they had a Church and pastors but inuisible, and so must not be vrged to shevv a succession of ether. but this I haue reiected in this chapter, and the first chapter of the first booke of my Surucy and reply: vvhere I haue proued that the Church can nether fal, being builded on a rocke, nor yet lose her visibilitie, being a *Citie on an Hil*. And so if *Sotcliffes* Church bee descended from the Apostles, he must shevv vs a visible succession of it from age to age, by vvhich as a chayne, he is linked to the Apostles: which he shal as hardly do, as make a chayne of sandes, or fetch his pedegree frō King Arthur.

Luth. Cal. sup. fol. 40 & 41.

Io. 16.

Math. 5.

A fourth euasiō is this: they say, that they succeed the ancient Church and Bishops in that they taught rigth, and conformably to scriptures: of vvhich conformitie also they vvilbe iudges. This is the shift of the *Magdeburgians*, vvho endeuouring to shevv a succession of their Church and Religion, do set dovvn in euery age, the continaunce of doctrine and faith, in vvhich they and vvee aggree: as of one God, of the *Trinitie*, of the *Incarnatiō*, of *Christs twoe natures*, and *one person*, and such like. and then they set dovvn in euery age, the *declining of faith*: and vnder that Title, they comprehend the *Sacrifice* of the *Masse*, *satisfaction*, *freevvil*, merit of good vvorkes, *vovves*, *Images*, the vse of the *crosse* and such like. And so they say that they succeed to the Apostles and primatiue Church, bicause they take those pointes frō them: as for the other pointes, they cal them *stubble* & *straw* and *errours* & *declininges of doctrine*. And this is in effect *Sotcliffes* answere, vvhen he saith: *vvee succeed also the Bishops of England before Bishop Crāmer, in al thinges they taught vvel*, as though no Bishops of Inglād taught in al pointes wel, till *Cranmer*. But for this answer, I haue taken *Sotc.* vp aboue in the first chapter of this my Reply. Here against both him

4. shift.

Sotc. pag. 41.

fol. 41. pag. 1.

and the *Magdeburgians*, I add first, that if this
The refutation. cuasiō be admitted, euery heretike may deriue a succession, because no heretike euer was, who aggreed not in some pointes with the true Church: and as for the other pointes, in vvhich he dissenteth, he may put thē aside, amongest *errors* and *declinings of faith*, as not consonaunt in his opinion to scriptur. Secōdly thus in very deed the *Magdeburgians*, do set dovvn the succession of the *Catholike Romain Church*: bicause the same Church that taught *one God, three persons in one God-head, tvvoe natures in one person of Christ*, &c. did also teach the other pointes, which they cal *stubble* and *straw*, and *errors* and *declinings*. Thirdly if they would haue delte sincerly, as they pretende, they should haue set dovvn the line of their Bishops, the practise of their ministerie, discipline, and gouuernment, and should haue shevved, that it vvas then no other then novv it is: they should also haue shevved vs a Church, vvhich taught not only that there is a *God*, that there are 3. *persons in one God head, that the* second person vvas *true God and man* &c. but also which condemned *Purgatorie, Masse, Images, prayer, to saintes and for the dead, merit, and satisfaction dent and other fastes, free vvil*, and such like.

but such a Church, they could neuer shevv in any of the ages after Christe, and good reason, bicause that vvhich neuer vvas, can not be seen or shevved.

8. Then *Sotc.* bableth much about *bare scripture*, and his *national and general Councel*, and *falling of the Church*, thinges already discussed: he also boldly pronounceth, that *Luther* neuer sayd those vvordes *Audemus dicere a nobis primo diuulgatum esse Christum*: but I ame sure I haue read them, though novv I haue not that tome: in the meane tyme I vvill alleage him other wordes æquiualent. *Euangelion tam opulenter predicatum est vt Apostolorum tempore, ea claritate non fuerit*: *the Ghospel is so richly preached (by Luther) that it had not that light in the Apostles tyme.* And so *Luther* vvas the first that brought this light. and again he saith that *God hath reuealed to him the knovvledge of his Sonne that he at length might euangelize it to others*: and in the same place he saith, he may more iustly be called an Euangelist, then Catholike Bishops may be termed Bishops. and yet again in his *Glosse against the pretended Edict Imperial*, he calles him selfe *the Euangelist of our lord Iesus Christe*, as though he after the Apostles vvere the first man that reuea-

Abone booke 1. chap. 2.6.

to.7 in pr. Vvit. 1557. fol. 271.

Luth. to. 7 fol. 307.

led the truth and brought the Ghospel to light. And conformably to this, the Tigurin Ministers complain, that Luther maketh him selfe *the Prophet and Apostle of the Germanes, vvho hath learned of none, and of vvhom, al haue learned.* Sotcl: denyeth vvith the like audacitie that *Caluin* sayd Plocas made Boniface Suprem head, which Title S. Gregorie refused. But let him read *Caluin.* he hath espied another fault, in that I alleage *Luther de notis Ecclesiæ*, he hauing vvritten no such booke. See the rashnes or falsenes of this fellovv. looke thē again Sir *Sot:* & in *Luthers* 7. tome, imprinted at Vvittemberg, the yeare 1557. in the leafe 147. you shal find a litle booke of 8. leaues *in folio*, vvhose Title is this: *de Ecclesia, quid sit & quæ sit Ecclesia, vbi sit, & quæ sint notæ veræ Ecclesiæ.* And be not so rash hereafter. and this is al he answereth to my argument grounded in succession.

In confess Germ an. 1544.

Caluin. l. 4. c. 7. §. 17.

9. To conclude therfore, if *Sotc:* vvill shew his Church to bee descēded frō th' Apostles, let him vnfold the rolle of his Bishops and tell vs in what part of the world his Church lurked for a 1500. yeares? In vvhat Caues or thickettes it vvas hidden? In what chappels it serued God? did it neuer come abroad? did the sonne neuer shine vppon it? then must it

The conclusion.

needs bee moſt beautful at the firſt appearaunce in Luthers tyme, not hauing been ſunburned for 1500. yeares. Or did it come abroad, but diſſembling faith, frequented the Papiſts Maſſes, and vvorſhipped their Images. Then vvas it no true Church, bicauſe it profeſſed noe true faith: yea then vvas it an idolatreſſ, in your opinion. Then vvas it not viſible: and ſo al that tyme the vvorld, that could not find outan inuiſible Church, vvas vvithout ſaluation, for 1500. yeares: bicauſe (as *Calum* him ſelfe cõfeſſeth) *extra gremium viſibilis Eccleſiæ nulla eſt ſperanda peccatorum remiſsio, nulla ſalus: out of the lapp, of the viſible Church no remiſsion of ſinnes, no ſaluation is to be hoped for.* Or vvas it not at al before Luther? (as certes *Sotcl.* can as hardly finde out *Platoes Ides* or *common vvealth*, yea the man in the moone, as any ſuch Church) then if vvee Iudge of vvater by the fountaine, or of a mans gentry by the firſt of his familie, or of a mans tight and Title to a Lordſhip, by the firſt ovvner & poſſeſſour: *Sotcliffes* Church can not be Apoſtolical, but apoſtolical: bicauſe it is not deſcended from the Apoſtles: nor he any lavvfull heir of theirs, but rather an alié and baſtardly Impe, vvhich comes in by the vvronge dore, & the

l. 4. c. 1. §. 4

left side, hauing no cõsanguinitie with them. Opẽ then your eyes my deareſt countrimẽ,
Mat. 5. andbehold that Church, which you can not but ſee, bicauſe it is a Citie ſituated on a hil: and runne no more after ſhadovves, and this imagined Church of yours. You ſeeke after the true Church out of vvhich is no ſaluation: and that, you ſee, can be no other then the Church planted by the Apoſtles, vvhich alſo muſt needes be the Catholike Romain Church, bicauſe that only can be deriued from the Apoſtles, of that only the anciẽt Chriſtians were members, in that only the ancient Doctours taught, againſt that only the deuil raiſed perſequutions, that only condemned hereſies, that only called ſo many Councels, by that only cõtries haue been cõuerted & ſaued, if any ſince Chriſte haue been ſaued: as for this nevv Church it vvas neuer ſeen, heard nor felt before *Luther*: and ſo vniting your ſelues to it, you are not linked by the line of ſucceſſion to that true and only Church, and conſequently like members cut off from the body, you vvither for vvant of life, like riuers cut of from the the fountaine, you dry vp for want of water, like beames or rayes ſeparated from the ſonne, you decay and periſh.

# The somme of the 6. chapter.

*After a long commendation of peace, which al thinges, desire bicause it conserueth al: and after a dispraise of dissension, which weakeneth and ruineth al thinges, but especially societies: I proue out of Scriptures, that Christe bequeathed this iewel to his Church, as the knot of al Societies: and I bring reason to second Scriptures: bicause the truth being but one, and the visible head of the Church (who also can not swerue from this truth) but one: it can not be, but that they who professe one truth, and obey one head, must needs conspire in one. This peace of the Church militaunt is more admirable then that of the Church Triumphant, as my reason which I alleage conuinceth. This peace in matters of faith was euer to be found in the true Church: neuer in any heretical synagogue. In the Catholike Roman Church is no dissension in faith, only ther is diuersitie in schoole pointes not pertaining to faith, and in Orders of life not repugnaunt to faith: but amongest the Ghospellers there is continual iarring and squaring in matters of faith, euen by their owne confession: and so their Church is not the peaceble Church of Christe, but a wrangling conuenticle, and they are noe true Christians, but mutinous heretikes.*

Isa. 2. 11. 65. Io 14. Ephes. 4. Act. 4.

## Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.

1. Sotcliff complaineth of my tediouse discourse of peace and dissension: & no meruail. For to the guiltie, nothing seemeth so long as the Accusers Accusation and the iudges sentence, be they neuer so short and compendious: To my argument he answereth, first, that it makes as much against vs, vvho dissent from the fathers and amongest our selues, *as is proued by the differences of Thomists and Scotists*. But hovv vvee hold vvith fathers, and hovv they disclaim from them, and do giue no more credit to them, then to Turkes and Ievves: vvee haue already declared in the first booke of this Reply: as for the dissension of *Thomists* and *Scotists*, it is already answvered to be no dissension in faith (and therfore the one condēneth not the other for heretikes, as *Lutheranes* do *Caluinistes*) but only in disputable pointes of y^e^ Schoole. And this answer you savve, and yet, bringing nothing against it, you repeate th'obiectiō, as though I had not already answered. But saith *Sotc*: the Schoole mē differ *in the highest pointes of Religiō: As namely whether the holy Ghost proceed more principally from the Father then the Sonne, about the*

fol. 17. pag. 101. 60. 61.

*divine notions (vvhich to* Sotc. *are ignotions) about the Attributes of God, about meritum congrui, about the cause of prædestination, about the thing designed by the vvord, Hoc, in these vvordes,* hoc est corpus meum, *about the Conception of the B. Virgin.* This stale obiection he stoale out of Ievvels Apollogie pag. 95. But it proving no disaggreement in ether high or low pointes of faith, but only of Philosophie and Schoole pointes, is already answvered.

2. Hauing thus blotted a litle Paper in these obiections: he assayeth, hovv he can defend him selfe from this marke of dissension. *Sixthly,* saith he, *al the reformed* (o Reformation) *Churches of England, Scotlād, Fraunce, Denmark, Flanders, Germany, and other countries do vvel agree.* (O the svveet aggreement.) *If any difference ther bee among vs,* (and is it so litle that an, If, vvas necessarie?) *it is about ceremonies and exposition of vvords, vvithout breach of vnitie, and not matters of faith and doctrine.* This lesson he learned of his Maister *Beza* in answvering one *Andreas Dudithius,* vvho being much scandalized at their dissension demaunded, *vvhere that bond of peace vvas, vvhich our Sauiour left? vvher vvas that vnitie of the Church? vvhere that one faith vvas? one Baptisme? one God?* *Beza* answvereth, that

Sotc. pag. 42. The Ghospellers say they aggree.

Beza 1 ep. Theol ep. 1. edit. 3. 1597.

Setting a side the *Papists*, with whom he will haue noe peace, as also the *Anabaptists*, *Libertins*, *Antinomes*, *Tritheits*, *Arrians* and *Samosatenians*, al the rest aggree sufficiently in faith. *I say therfore* (saith he) *that the Helvetian and French confessiõs, to which almost innumerable Churches haue subscribed, differ not at al in any thing*, &c. *I say they are impudent calumniators who forge discord betwixt those greatest men, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Calvin, in the doctrin of Sacraments*, &c. *I say that the same doctrine through out al, is proposed and holden with greatest consent, both by wordes and writings, in the Helvetian, Subaudian, French, Belgicke, and Scottish, yea and* (as I thinke) *English Churches*. Yet a litle after he confesseth differences in wordes and explications (as *Sotus* doth) euen about *Christs* Supper, but yet sayth hee, we say al one thing, and keep the Fondation. The same, the diuines and ministers of *Geneua* and *Zurick*, do boldly affirme, as heresie hath imprinted in their forheads, an vndefaceable caracter of Impudẽcie. With the same audacitie, the *Apologie* of the *Church* of *England* and *Fox*, do auerr and auouch this aggreement. So that they who condemne so bitterly one another euen to Hel: do aggree well enough, and are members of one Church

sup pag. 5.

Præfat. in Harm. Confess.
Præfat. Apol. ad re form. Eccles. Apol. Eccl. Ang.
Fox in 8ᵛᵉ 8. in Act. Luther.

Church, and children of one familie, vvhen their diſſenſion is by vs noted and imputed vnto them.

3. Novv therfore it remaineth, that I proue them ſo to differ in faith and Church that they can not make vp one Church, but muſt needs be many vvrangling ſectes and cõuenticles: and this I ſhal proue moſt euidently. Firſt, the Church being a congregation of the faithful, one faith is neceſſarie to make one Church: for they that in faith are ſeuered from the true Chriſtians, vvere euer counted heretikes or infidels, therfore S. *Paule* ſaith, *one Lord, one faith, one Baptiſm:* But the Ghoſpellers of this tyme differ in faith: ergo they haue not the vnitie requiſite to one Church. The *Minor propoſition*, to vvit, that the Ghoſpellers of this tyme differ in faith, I proue by theſe their diuers opinions in articles, or matters of faith. *Luther* ſaith that *Chriſt* is really in the *B. Sacrament* though vvith the bread. Caluin ſaith he is not really in the *B. Sacramẽt*, but as farr from it as heauen is from earth. The *Caluiniſts* and *Sacramentaries*, are of opinion that the vvicked and vnfaithful eate not Chriſtes body but only the ſignes, bicauſe they acknowledge noe real eating but only by y^e ſpirit &c

Tharchoſ pellers aggree nor,is pro. ued.

The firſt prooſe.

Epheſ. 4.

Luth. ep. ad Argen. tin. Cal. l. 4. Inſt. ca. 17.

Cal. Leõ. Heſ huſ. caroliſt. de verb. cæn.

faith. The *Lutheranes* vvil not accord to this: for as they hold Christes body to be really in this Sacramēt, so they say it is really receiued. *Luther* saith plainly Christes body is eaten as vvel of the vvorthy as vnvvorthy: so say his Lutheranes. *Luther* in his *Greater Confession and in a sermon of the Sacrament of Christs body and bloud*, saith Christes body is as immense as the diuinitie, and in al places in vvich the diuinitie is, not only in bread cōsecrated, as Catholikes say, but in al bread, in the earth, vvater, ayre, fier, and al thinges. The Sacramentaries cal this a monstrous imaginatiō. *Zuinglius* denyeth it flatly, Caluin saith, this opinion is vvorse then the Papists opinion, yea that it sauoureth of *Eutiches* and *Seruetus*. Luther in his *booke of Councels*, saith that the diuine natur in Christ suffred: to vvhom *Andreas Musculus*, and *Iacobus Andreæ* haue subscribed: *Beza* contradicteth this, saying that the sonne of God, according to his diuinitie is *impassible, and can be subiect to no passion*. *Caluin* vvith the *Nestorians*, faineth tvvoe persons in Christe: the one of God, the other of man and the mediatour: *Beza* holdeth tvvoe *Hypostatical vnions* in Christ, vvhence followv, tvvoe persons: vvhether they speake of igno-

Occolāp. cont confess Luth.
Luth. cōt. anticlonā In artic. Smalcald.

Zuin. cōt. Confess. Luth. & in Exegesi.
Calu. li. 4 Inst. c. 17.
Luth. li de Concep.
And. musc. li. 4. concord. lāc. And. thesi 156.
Calumny Li. Inst. c. 13. §. 9. 23. 24. Beza. Opusc. ad arg. Brēt. pag 513. 638. 639. An. 1570.

raunce, or of Nestorian malice I know not. To these men, the *Lutherans* oppose themselues, auouching that ther is but one *person* in Christ, and accusing *Beza* for a *Nestorian*. *Calvin* and the Caluinists, are not affrayd to make God the *Author*, *willer* and *worker*, of sinne. So saith *Beza* also. The *Lutherans* detest it as blasphemie. *Calvin* calleth *Dimbus Parvus* a Fable, vvhich yet hath great Authors, *Christi autem animam illuc descendere ut eam mortuis restitueret, quid opus fuit? but vvhat necessitie vvas ther, that Christs soule should descend thither to deliuuer the soules?* *Beza*, to deny the more easilie Christs descension into Hel, vvhen he should haue explicated those vvordes, *thou shalt not leaue my soule in Hel*, by *soule* vnderstandeth the dead body, by *Hel* the graue. And yet the *Lutherans* in *Germanie*, and the *Protestannes* in *England*, do graunt *Christes descension to Hel*. So that these men differing in faith, and in faith concerning the real presence, for vvch the *Caluinists*, condemne *Papists* to Hel; concerning the humane and diuine nature, and Christs diuine person, cõcerning Gods goodnes, which is made the cause of sinne; cõcerning an article of our *creed*, vvhich is *Christes descension to Hel*, and other pointes vvhich shalbe al-

Lutherani in Colloq. mõtisbelgard. Cal. li. 1. Inst. c. 18. Beza in Colloq. Mompelg. Conrad. li. 1. Theol. Calu. e de prædest. Calu. li. 2. Inst. c. 16. §. 9. ann. 1592. Beza in c. 2 Act. Luth. p. 2. Isleb. ad Psal. 15. Conrad. l. 1. Theol. Calu. c. 27.

leaged, the one sect or other, must needs be heretikes, and so can not both consort in one Church.

4. My second argument is this. the right administration and vse of the Sacraments, is necessarie to make a true mēber of y^e Churche: for by them vvee are incorporated to the Church, by them vvee are sanctified, by them vvee professe our faith, by them vvee are distinguished: and therfore S. *Austin* saith, that as yet, neuer any societie could ioine in one Religion, but by the vse of the same Sacraments: But in this point also these *Cadmean* brethren, do square and varie, *ergo* they are not of one Church or Religion. The *Assumption* or *minor Proposition*, to vvit, that in Sacraments they differ, I proue by their owvn assertions. *The Lutherans* commonly afforde vs three Sacramēts, *Baptisme*, *Pœnaunce*, and the *Eucharist*, as appeareth by their *Catechismes*, yet *Zuinglius* affordeth but tvvoe Sacraments, *Baptism*, and the *Supper*, though in another place, he addeth *Matrimonie*. *Caluin* graunteth three vvith the *Lutherans*, but not al the same, *Baptism*, the *Supper*, and *Order*. The soft *Lutherans* in a *Councel* holden at *Lipsia*, decreed 7. Sacraments. And so these men hauing diuers Sacramēts

2. proofe.

I. 10. cont. Faust. Manich c. 10.

apud Bel. to. 1. li. 2. controu. 5. c. 25. Zuing. li. de vera & falsa Relc de Sacramentis. cap. de matrim apud Bel. ibid.

must needes be diuers Churches, especially in Luthers opinion, vvho holdeth true administration of the vvord and Sacraments, for a mark of the true Church, to vvhich *Cõfessio Augustana*, & *Caluin* him selfe subscribeth; yea, although in deed this is no good marke, bicause it is not euident vvho preacheth and administreth Sacraments rigthly, yet certain it is, that vvhere is no true administration of Sacramẽts (as ther is not wher is not the iust number) there can not be the true Church: and so al these hauing not the iust number (one sect holding 2. Sacramẽts, another 3. but not the same 3. and *Caluin* holding Baptism not necessarie, *Luther* æsteeming it necessarie to saluation) can not make one Church, hauing no vnitie in Sacraments. Ibidem. Lut. lib. de Conc. pa. vlt. Conf. Aug. c. 7. Calu. li. 4. Inst. c. 1. Calu. li. 4. Inst. c. 5. Luth. in cõfor. tat. Latom.

5. My third proofe is this: vvithout the vvorship of the true God, the Church can not consist, it being a congregation of them that vvorship him: and consequently they vvho are Idolatours, can not Sympathize in one Church vvith them that vvorship the true God; but the *Lutherans*, by the *Sacramentaries*, are deemed Idolatours, *ergo Lutherans* and *Sacramentaries*, are not of one Church and faith. That the *Lutherans* are 3. Proofe. vvorship of God.

by the Sacramentaries adiudged Idolatours, I proue thus. *Luther* saith that the *B. Sacrament* is to be adored, because it containeth Christe really: and to him subscribeth *Brentius*, *Caluin* and *Beza*, and al the *Zuinglians*, and *Protestants*, and *Puritanes* in England, vvho hold that Christ is not really in the Sacrament, auouch, and must needs auouch, this to be Idolatrie. For if Christ be not really in the Sacrament, they adoring the Sacrament, giue diuine honour to a peece of bread or a signe, vvhich is not God, and so are Idolatours. The same *Luther* approueth the *Elevation* of this Sacrament: *Beza* and the *Caluinists*, condemne it as Idolatrie. But Idolatours can not haue one faith and Church vvith true beleeuers (as the Caluinists vvil be æsteemed) *ergo Lutherans*, and *Caluinists*, dissent in faith and Church.

Luth. cap. Anat. Lonan. Brer. in Apol. conf. Vvitemb.

Luth. li. capt. Bab & in formula Miss. Beza de cœn. Dom. cõt. Vvestphalum.

4. Proofe. Plato in Politic. Ar. l. 3. Polit. c. 5. l. 8. Eth. c. 10. Plutarch.

6. My fourth proof shal be drawn from the gouernment of their Churches. *Plato* and *Aristotle*, and other Philosophers distinguish three kindes of gouernment. the first is called *Monarchia*, in vvhich one only hath Supreme authoritie, such as is the Gouernment of Kingdomes. The second is called *Aristocratia*, in vvhich diuers *Potentates*, haue æqual authoritie ouer the cõmon vvealth.

3 Kinds of gouernment.

The third is called *Democratia*, in vvhich the People hath supreme power to make lawes, and to appoint or depose Magistrates. And according to these gouernmẽts, they distinguish common vvelthes. Vvherfore seing that the Church is a spiritual cõmon vvelth, compared in *Scriptur*, to a *Kingdome*: vvhere there are diuers gouernments, there can not be one Church: But amongest these Ghospellers are diuers gouernmẽts of the church, *ergo* they are not one Church. That ther are diuers gouernmentes amongest them, it is needles to proue, bicause vvee see it. The *Protestaunts* of *Ingland*, make their Church a *Monarchie*, in vvhich they say the *Prince* is supreme Iudge, from vvhom, as aboue vvee haue seen, al Iurisdiction Ecclesiastical proceedeth: or rather they make the Gouernment of the Church *Aristocracie*, bicause they teach that euery Prince in his Realm, is Suprem Head of his Church. The *Puritanes* of *Ingland*, *Scotland*, *Helvetia*, *Zurich*, *Berne*, *Geneua*, *Polonia*, and *Hungarie*, hold aqualitie of ministers, and the electiõ of ministers they graunt to the People. So that they seeme to graunt the Suprem povver Ecclesiastical to the People. For though the *Presbyterie*, amongest them do immediatly

Mat. 13.

Fol. 79. pag. 2.

Admonit. to the parlament.

rule, yet they being elected and appointed by the People, it seemeth that their gouernment is *Democracie*. So that these *Ghospellers*, hauing diuers gouernmẽts, can not bee one common vvelth, and so are not one, but diuers Churches. According to this the *Puritanes*, deny that there is any true Iurisdiction Ecclesiastical in the Church of the *Protestaunts*, and therfore if a *Protestant* minister, come to be a *Puritan*, he receueth again his calling from the *Classes*, vvhich are companies of Neighbour ministers, or from the *Consistorie*, or *Presbyterie*. Yea as the booke of dangerous posinons hath profitably reuealed to the vvorld, they cal the gouernment of the Protestant Church, *Antichristian, deuilish, litle better then that of the Samaritanes, traiterous against the Maiestie of Iesus Christe, a false, vnlawfull, and bastardly Gouernment*, vvith whom aggree *Caluin*, and *Beza*. And seing that noe Church nor common vvelth can be vvithout gouernment and Iurisdiction, it followeth necessarilie, that the *Protestaunts* and *Puritans*, can not make one Church, they hauing diuers gouernments, and the one condemning the others gouernment.

Admonit. to the parlam. dangerous positions l. 2. c. 4. 6.

Calu. li. 4 Inst. c. 4. 5 & in c. 1. & 7 Amos.

Beza epi. 21. ad orin. dallum.

7. My fift argument is grounded in their *liturgie, booke of common prayer*, and *Church-seruice*. for the vvorship of God consisteth in seruice, and therfore vvhere there is noe true seruice, there can bee noe true Church: but the *Puritans* auouch, that the *Protestaunt liturgie* and *seruice*, is no true seruice of God, *ergo* the *Protestaunts* are no true Church, and consequently can not make one Church vvith the *Puritanes*. Certes the Puritanes in their Admonition, say the *booke* of *common prayer*, vvhich the *Protestaunts* vse, is patched vp together out of the *Popes Portus*, and their *communion booke*, out of the *Popes Masse*. and the *Lutheranes*, as *Illyricus* and *Conradus* (to be euen with them) doe condemne *Calvins liturgie*, as *contaminated not vvith one only sacrilege*, and as the thing vvhich hath been the damnation of many soules. So that these men disaggreing in seruice, and condemning eche others seruice, can not be of one Church or faith. 5. proofe. Admon. to the parlam. pag. 4. 5. Illyr. in defens. conf. Lut. ca. 7. Coun. l. 3. Theol. Cala.

8. My Sixt proofe is this: it is necessarilie required to one Church and faith, that the members of it haue one ground and fondation, and rely on the same word of God, and diuine authoritie. Yea it is necessarie that this faith rely, not on the same letter only 6. proofe.

of scriptur, but also on the same sense and meaning, this being the life of the vvord, as vve haue seen aboue: But the *Reformers* disagree, not only in bookes of scriptur, but also in the meaning of them, *ergo* they haue not one faith and Church. That aggreement, euen in the sense of Scriptur, is necessarie, I proue: bicause the *Arrians*, *Nestorians*, and *Eutichians*, alleaged Scriptur, as vvel as the Catholike Fathers: and some tymes out of the same letter they gathered a diuerse sense. That the reformers differ in bookes *Canonical*, it is playn. for *Luther* denyes *S. Iames* his Epistle, *Caluin* graunts it. *Luther* reiecteth the *Epistle* to the *Hebrevves*, *Caluin* admitteth it. And so *Caluin* according to *Luthers* opinion, groundeth his faith on a book not canonical, and consequently hath no diuine not true faith, but an humain and false faith: and so one fayth and Church can not hold *Lutherianes* and *Caluinists*. That these men diuersly expound scriptur, and so differ in the meaning, this one place of scriptur, *Hoc est corpus meum, this is my body*, vvill vvitnesse. For the *Lutherianes*, expound it really, the *Zuinglians* and *Caluinists* figuratiuely and spiritually: and so the *Lutherianes* out of these vvordes proue, that Christs b.dy is

lib. 1. c. 2.

Luth. in Prol. Calu in argumento Epist. Luth. in Prol. Calu li. 1. Inst. c. 8. an. 1554.

Mat. 26.

really in the *B. Sacrament*, vvhich the others condemne as a monstrous exposition. And seing that it is the sense which especially makes the letter of scriptur to bee Gods vvord, it followeth that one of these sectes do not grounde their faith on Gods vvord, and so one Church and faith can not hold them.

9. Seuenthly, Schismatikes can not make one body vvith that Church, from vvhich by *Schisme* they are seuered, no more then the bovve cut of, can be part of the tree, to vvhich it had been vnited. and therfore S. *Ireneus*, S. *Chrisostome*, S. *Ciprian*, S. *Austin*, S. *Hierom*, *Optatus* and *Fulgetius*, do count *Schismatikes* no members of the Church: but rather compare them to *Chore*, *Dathan*, and *Abiron*, seuered from *Moyses*, *Aaron*, and the people, yea to the 10. *Tribes* of *Israel*, vvho leauing *Roboam*, vnited them selues to *Hieroboam*, and imbraced nevv Sacrifices and Ceremonies. But the *Puritanes* in England (vvho are al one vvith the *Caluinists* in *France*, *Scotland*, and other places aboue mentioned) are by the *Protestaunt Bishops* of *England*, in their nevv *Canons*, can. 9. 10. censured as *Schismatikes*, *ergo* they are not of the Protestaunts Church, and consequently do not make one Church vvith them.

7. proofe. Iren. l. 4. c. 61. Chrys. hom. 1. in ep. 1. Cor. hom. 11. in ep. Ephes. Cip. causa 7. q. 1. cap. Scire. & 24 q. 1. c. Loquitur. Aug. li. de Fide & Symb. ca. 10. Hier. 24. q. 3. ca. Inter hæresim. & in c. 1. Amos. & ca. 3. ad Tit. Opt. li. 1. 2. cont. Parm. Fulg li. de fide ad Petrum c. 38. 39. Num. 16. 3. Reg. 12.

Conc. Ausan. n. q. 3. ca. Canonica. Mat. 18. Eightly, excommunicated persons, are no members of the Church, being cut of by censure: and therfore Christ speaking of him that is excõmunicated for not obeying the Church, commaunds vs to æsteem no othervvise of him, then of an *Ethnike* and *Publican*. And S. *Paule*, as S. *Austin* expoundeth, is therfore sayd to haue deliuered the Incestuous by excommunication vnto *Satan*, bicause he cast him out of the Church vvhere Satan is, as Christ is in the Church. But the *Puritanes* are by the afore sayd *nevv Canons*, excommunicated *ipso facto*, *ergo* they are not of the *Protestaunts* Church, and cõsequently do not make one Church with thẽ.

1. Cor. 5. Aug. ser. 69. de verbis Apost. Can. 4. 6. 7

2. proofe. 10. Lastly this I proue by their own vvordes, vvhich is no infirme proof, bicause no greater testimonie is, then the guilties ovvn and free confession. and I vvil make *Luther* speake first bicause he vvas the first. Speake then Luther, and tel vs vvhether *Lutheranes* and *Sacramentaries, aggree vvel enough, as Sotcl.* sayth, and by thy vvords, put this thy Scholler to silence, and let him harken now vvho hath talked to much. *Vvee Seriously* (saith he) *censure as heretikes and Aliens from the Church of God, al Zuinglians and Sacramentaries* (vnder vvhom the Protestaunts and

Hereykes cõdemne one another.

Luth. cõt. art. Louan. thesi 27.

Puritanes of Ingland are comprehended) *vvho deny Christs body to be eaten by the Carnal mouth in the venerable Eucharist. And again:* Ep. ad Iacobum Presbyt. Ieclacem. Doctorē. *mihi satis est omnium infœlicissimo, vna ista beatitudo: Beatus vir qui non abijt in consilio Sacramentariorum, nec stetit in via Zuinglianorum, nec sedit in Cathedra Tigurinorum, To me the vnhappiest of al men, this Blessednes is sufficient: Happie is the man vvhich hath not gone in the vvay of the Sacramentaries, nor hath stood in the vvay of the Zuinglians, nor hath sitten in the Chayre of the Tigurines.* And again: *Ego tanquam alterum iam pedem in sepulchro habens, hoc testimonium et hanc gloriam ad tribunal Domini adferam* l. de cœna Dom. to. 2. Germ. fol. 174. *quod hostes Sacramenti Carolstadium, Zuinglium, Oecolampadium, eorumque discipulos toto pectore damnarim ac vitarim, nec habeo cum quoquam eorum familiaritatem, neque literis neque scriptis, neque verbis, sicut Dominus precepit: I haung now vvil it vvere one foot in my graue, vvil carrye this testimonie and this glorie to the tribunal of the lord, that I haue condemned and auoyded the enemies of the Sacramēt, Carolstadius, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius and their disciples, nor haue vvith any of them familiaritie, either in letters or vvritings, or vvordes. yea* (saith he) *I confesse I recken no more Zuinglius, in the number of Christians.* Ibid. fol. 190. And if our Peacemāker *Sorcliff* answer, that *Luther*

exaggreateth this dissention, it being but in smal matters, and *about exposition of vvordes only, the Magdeburgias, Luthers* cheefest Schollers, vvill auouch, that *these contentions are not about goates vvolle, nor* περὶ μυρεψικῆς, *vvarres about vvordes, but such as cõcerne those doctrines, which are the common good of the Church. One Ihon Iezler* describing the vvarres or contentions about the *Eucharist*, saith, that the first vvarre about the Sacrament raised by *Luther* and *Carolstadius*, vvas in the yeare 1525. the second, vvas raised by *Luther* and the *Tigurines*, in the yeare 1544. The third by *Vvestphalus* and *Caluin* in the yeare 1553. the fourth by *Heshusius* and *Clebitius* in the yeare 1554. the fift by *Brentius* and *Bullenger* in the yeare 1561. And during these vvarres, saith he, *irrisions, bitter tauntes, hatreds, contemptes, detraction, Calumnies, Pasquilles, al kinde of iniuries, banishmentes, condemning, vvere their daily food.* And again, he saith, that the *Lutheranes* auouch that the *Zuinglians are convicted heretikes, possessed vvith deuils on al sides, before, behind, aboue, beneath, vvithin, and vvithout, martyrs of the deuil, to be reckned amongest the Anabaptists, Nestorians, Arians, Turkes.* And the *Caluinists* are euen vvith the *Lutheranes*: for they (as the same authour relateth) call the *Lutheranes*, es-

Præfat. in l. 2. cent. 1

li. de diuturnit. belli Eucharistici pa. 25.

pag. 83.

ters of mannes flesh, drinkers of mannes bloud, killers of Christe, vvorshippers of bread, and of a bready God, Eutichians, Suencfeldians, destroyers of many articles of faith. Zuinglius in an Epistle to Luther, vnless ignorannce (saith he) excuse thee, vve iudge thee to be a seductour, impostour, a denyer of Christe, and vvorse then Marcion. Caluin calles the Lutheranes, Eutichians and Seruetians, for affirming Christs body to be as immense as is the diuinitie: yea he calles them, *vertiginosas Ciclopes, superbam factionem Gigantum, phreneticos, bestias, prodigiose cecos, desperate impudentes, nihil aliud quam falsarios, & in probos calũniatores &c.* Giddie-brayned Ciclopes, a proud faction of Giants, phrenetike, beastes, prodigiously blind, desperatly impudent, nothing else but Falsarines, and vvicked calumniatours. yea he complaineth that the *Lutheranes* vvil needes haue *Luther to be called Helias: and to graunt him the name of Helias* (saith hee) *yet it is sacrilegious rashnes, to say he is the last Helias:* vvhich *Caluin* sayd, bicause he would be him selfe also another Helias. The *Tigurines* complaint of *Luther*, the Reader may read in their *Confession*, vvhere he shal finde that they say *Luthers booke is full of deuils, and tauntes*, and call him *Archeretike*. *Beza* his tauntes and nicknames of *Hesshusius* are to be read in his *Chorographia*,

l. 4. Inst. c. 17. § 30.

Calu. admonit. 3. ad Ioach. vvestphal. li. contra Hel. huf.

Admonit. vlt.

Confess. Germ. an. 1544.

some other inuectiues I had related which Sotcliff would not see. If the reader will see more, let him read *Iodocus Coccius* his *first tome* and 8. *booke*. I now will conclude, that these diuers sectes can not make vp one Church they disaggreing in faith, in Sacraments, scriptures, seruice, and worship of God, and gouernment of their Church, yea they excommunicating one another for heretikes and Schismatikes, and confessing that they disaggree in capital pointes of faith: and consequently that *Sotcliff* is a botching peeter, rather then a Peace-maker, that will make them brethren euen against their willes, yet noe worse a loiner then *Peter Martyr*, who saith, *that it is to be lamented and meruailed that the Lutheran Ministers do so abhorre from him and his fellow Sacramentaries, that they will not count them brethren: but our churches* (saith he) *count them for brethrē, whether they will or not.* yet seing that no man can bee a member of the Church, vnlesse he beleeue, and can not bee made to beleeue, vnles he will, it is impossible they should be members of one Church against their willes: and *Sotcliff* may as well make a rope of Sādes, as a Church of such iarring and disaggreeing peeces, which do not aggree, will not aggree, and can not aggree

Coccius to. 1. l. 8.

in cap. 19. Iud.

aggree, bicause they haue no iudge nor rule to reconcile them, as aboue is proued. Vvher-as he saith they disagree in vvordes and expositions, that in some good sense may be true: bicause they all prouing their contrarie heresies out of scriptur, do disaggree in exposition of Scriptures: but vvhen he addeth, that this disaggreement *is vvithout breach of vnitie, and not about matters of faith*, if al the Belles in *Excester* should ring at once, they could not ring so lowd as he hath lyed: as appeareth by my 9. arguments. Certes, scriptures conteining almost al the mysteries of faith, al heresies against the Trinitie of persons in God, and diuinitie and humanitie of Christe, are disaggreements *about exposition of vvordes*, and yet about capital pointes of our faith also. Those sturres and controuersies vvhich the Arrians raysed, vvere about the meaning of those fevv vvords, *I and the father are one*, and those, *these three are one*, and those *The father is greater then I*. *The Nestorians* and *Eutichiās* dissented from the ancient Fathers in expositiō of those fevv vvords, *The vvord vvas made flesh*. The heretikes that denyed the resurrectiō, quarrelled also about these three vvordes *mortui resurgent incorrupti*, *the dead shal rise again vn-*

l. 1. c. 6.

Sotc. pag. 42.

Io. 10.

Io. 14.

Ioan. 1.

1. Cor. 15.

corrupt. The Catholikes also contend with al the sectes of this age, and they also with one another, how these fowre wordes are Mat.26. to be vnderstood, *This is my body*. And yet these disaggreements about so fewe wordes, were not λογομαχιαι only, but implyed a iarring and disaggreing, in the highest pointes of Religion.

11. But now that I haue proued that these sectes do differ in faith and Church, and so do weare the badg of an heretike, and can not bee the Church of Christ, which is a peaceable Kingdome: I demaund of *Sotcliff* a question, which I thinke a wiser man then he can not answer, to wit, what is that, which maketh a man a mēber of his church, & which being wanting, seuereth him from his Church? It is nether one faith and doctrine, nor the same Scripturs, nor the same seruice, nor Gouernment Ecclesiastical, for the *Sacramentaries* and *Lutheranes* do differ in al these, (as I haue shewed) and yet by *Sotc.* are made members of one Church. So al heretikes are members of his Church, euen *Marcionists*, *Eutichians* and *Nestorians*, bicause the *Lutheranes* (whom the *Caluinists* cal by those names, for saying that Christes diuinitie suffred, and that his humain nature is

What maketh a mēber of ye Church?

euery vvhere, vvith his diuinitie) are members of his Church: yea *Catholikes* vvhom he calleth *Papists*, must bee also of his Church, vvhether they vvil or noe. For they can not be excluded, but ether for the denial of the Princes *Supremacie*, or for affirming the real Præsence, or for idolatrie in vvorshipping Images and Saintes. Not for the first, bicause *Puritanes* aggree in that vvith Papists, and yet are members of his Church. Not for the second: bicause the *Lutheranes* hold the real præsence, & multiplication of Christs body in diuers places, as vvel as Papists, and yet are members of *Sotcliffs* Church. Not for the third, bicause, as I haue shevved in the third booke and last chapter, it is noe Idolatrie to vvorship them: and if it vvere yet *Lutherans*, vvhom the Sacramentaries call Idolatours for adoring the B. Sacrament, being admitted to *Sotcliffes* Church, Papists can not be excluded for Idolatrie, vvithout playn partialitie. V vhat is it then, vvhich maketh one a member of *Sotcliffes* Church, and vvhose vvant dismembreth him? Certes I see nothing, vnles one of these three things. The first is to reie& the Popes Supremacie: for in this, they al aghree: and *Fox* seemeth to count this sufficient, vvho hath raked vp above?

al sectes to make vp his Calender, and hath
l. 4. de tri-umpho crucis c. 1. put *Sauanorolla* (other vvise a Catholike, and vvho confesseth him to be an heretike who departs from the *Roman Church*) amongest them, bicause he preached indiscreetly against the Pope and Clergie of Rome. The second is the *Special faith*, by vvhich they assure them selues, that Christs iustice is theirs, & that they by it are iust & elect: for in this
l 3. Iust c. 2. § 9. 10. 11. 16. they also accord. yea *Calum* affirmeth that to beleeue the Trinitie & Incarnatiō is but an Image of faith, not vvorthy the name of faith, the *Special faith*, being only the viuificating and iustifying faith. And although this speech seem hard, yet al of them must allow it, for if the special faith only iustifieth, th n vvhatsoeuer a man beleeueth of other mysteries, if he beleeue that hee is iust he shalbe iust, and a liuely member also of the Church. The third is to beleeue the Trinitie and Incarnation, vvhich they cal the fondation: vvhich say they, if a man hold fast, he is a member of the Church good enough and may be saued wel enough, vvhatsoeuer his opinion be in other matters, vvhich to them are but petie matters. But if the first suffice, then the *Anabaptists*, and *Libertins*,
fol. ps 42 and *Brovvnists*, vvhom Sotcliff hath cast out

of his Church, yea the *Grecians*, vvho deny the processiō of the Holy Ghost from God the *Sonne*, and vvorship Images, admit 7. Sacraments, pray to Saints and for the dead, vvorship Saints and their Images, and say masses also, yea al heretikes must be penned vp in the Pinfold of *Sotcliffes* Church, bicause they al haue euer renounced the Popes authoritie. If the second suffice, then al the sectes of this age are of *Sotcliffes* Church, for the *Anabaptists*, and *Libertines*, and *Brownists*, accord in that: yea then if any should deny al but that, he should be a member of *Sotcl.* Church, hauing that vvhich maketh a member, vvhich is *special faith*. If the third be required, then *Lutherans*, vvhom *Sotc.* admitteth must be thrust out of his Church by the head and shoulders: bicause they holding that Christs diuinitie suffred, and that his humanitie is as immense as the diuinitie, do destroy the *Incarnation*, and deny Christ, in destroying his tvvoe naturs, as the Sacramentaries by me alleaged, do charge the *Lutherans*, calling thē therfore *Eutichians*, *Marcionists*, and *Manichies*. If the third, be sufficiēt, then al *Schismatikes*, who are only *Schismatikes*, are of this Church: bicause *Schismatikes* beleeue as true Catholikes doe, but are

Read the censur of the oriental church ca. 1. at. 7 13.

Luth. Andr. Musc. Iac. Andr. supra.

cast out for disobedience: yea then the *Nouatians*, *Donatists*, *Vigilantians*, *Pelagians*, and the greatest part of heretikes are, members of this Church, vvho al admit the *Trinitie*, and *Incarnation*. Is ther no band then not linke required to vnite a man to Sotcliffes Church? Certes, many prouinces make one Kingdom, and souldiours of diuers nations, one Armie, bicause they are gouerned by one head, and the same lawes: many bordes, make one Shipp, many stones one hovvse bicause they concurr in one forme and figure: many bowes make one tree, bicause they are linked in one tronke or Stock: many members compose one body, bicause they are animated by one soule, linked together by sinevves, and ioyned in one quantitie. But in *Sotc.* Church, ther is nether one faith, nor one vvord of God, nor one administration of Sacramẽts, nor one seruice, nor one Head, nor one Gouernment, nor one Ministerie, nor any one thing to vnite them in one: and consequently theirs is not Christes Church, which is *one*: but it is an *Aggregatum per Accidens*, a confused *Chaos* of al contrarieties, a songe of al discords, and a mixture of al Ingrediences.

11. This Peecer, thought him selfe to haue done a great peece of seruice for his Church, in ioyning so diuers peeces together: but besides that he may as soone ioyne heauen and Hel together, if wee should graunt him al these sectes to bee members of his church: his Church should haue smal honour by them. For first his Church should be the most mutinous conuenticle that euer vvas, consisting of those, that do nothing else but reuile and accurse one another to Hel, and so should be so farre from al resemblaunce of the peaceable Church of Christe, that it should be rather the Portrait of Hel, and should surpasse euen the deuils them selues, in scolding, vvrangling, cursing, and throwing of fire-brands, of hoat excommunications. It should resemble *Noes Arke* the figure of the Church in one point only. for as in that *Arke*, vvere al beasts so in [illegible] but in that vvere clean and vncleane, in [illegible] vncleane only, in that sauage, & contrarie natures liued peaceably together: in this they are cõtinually brawling and bickering, & ready euery hovvre to cast one another ouer board. Secondly his Church shalbe a body the most monstrous that euer vvas: more deformed then any *Gerion*, or *Hidra*, or *Centaur*,

or ridiculous *Horatian* monster: by reason, that it consisteth of so vnlike, and so improportionat partes: so that if the painter should paint a beast that should haue a limme of euery beast, this monstrous Church vvould surpasse it in deformitie.

13. Open then thine eyes, my deare Countrie, and behold only in vvhat a Church thou art, of vvhat an vgly body thou art become a member, and vvith vvhat wranglers and ianglers thou art linked in Societie: and retourn to the quiet haue and the peaceble Catholike Romain Church, in vvhich till *Luthers* tyme, thou enioyedst an heauenly peace, in matters of Religiō. In this Church al haue the same faith, the same hope, the same charitie. In this al obey one head, follow one rule, vvhich is the Churches definition, vse the same Sacraments, offer the same Sacrifice, and sing the same seruice, obserue the same [illegible]yes, and *eate of one bread, and drynke of one chalice* in the B. Sacrament: al vvhich, and this last especially do cause a vvonderfull peace and vnitie amongest vs. I say this last, for if they that sucke of one milke, and derive the same bloud from their parentes, contract Kinred and consanguinitie: much more are Christians Kinne and allyed, bicause

The vnitie of the Cath. church.

1 Cor 10. The B. Sacrament is cause of a great vnion.

the children of the same parents receue euery one, distinct nurritur, milke and blood: but Christians eate the same body and drinke the same bloud, and so are more neetly allyed. In this Church are diuers nations, yet in faith and Christe not diuers: in this Church are diuers languages, but al speake one faith: diuers offices and orders, but one Hierarchie: diuers rules of good life, in *Benedictins, Dominicans, Franciscans*, but one faith: diuers sectes in Philosophie and Schoole diuinitie, but vvhen the Church defineth, no moe *Thomists*, nor *Scotists*, but al obedient Christians: diuers members vvhich haue diuers functions, *but one body*. And so this is the Church to vvhom Christe bequeathed his peace, vvhich also *Dauid*, and *Esay* fortold, & the *Arke*, of *Noe* prefigured: The Church of the Ghospellers can not be this Church, bicause in it no peace nor vnitie is to bee found, rather it is an heretical, and vvrägling conuenticle, bicause dissension in faith (as I haue proued in this chapter, out of fathers, and by example of the *Simonians, Arrians, Nestorians, Eutichians, Donatists*, and others) hath euer been the badge of heretikes. Vvherfore to conclud with *S. Paule, I beseech you brethren to marke those that make dissensions, and scandels*

Ire. l. 1. c. 3.

1. Cor. 12. Isa. 11 65. psal. 71.

Soer. l. 1. c. 31. Aug. l. Agone Christ. ca. 19. Hil. li. cõ. const. Epipha. hær. 44. Rom. 16.

contrarie to the doctrine which you haue learned, and auoid them, for such do not serue Christe our Lord, but their owne belly, and by sweet speaches and benedictions, seduce the hartes of innocents.

## The somme of the 7. chapter.

THe natur of Good is to be good to others as is proued by examples of creaturs that communicate them selues. So God especially who is summum bonum, and Goodnes it selfe, hath liberally communicated him selfe by creation, but most of al by Incarnation. Wherfore since the tyme of his Incarnation, he would not be so sparing as to conclude faith and Church, within the confines of Iudea as before hee did, but hath sent his Apostles to preach to Iewes and Gentiles, and hath giuen them the guift of al tongues, to draw al the world to his Church. So that Christs Church is Catholike, as is proued by Scripturs and Fathers: and it is called Catholike, because it being one and the same, is diffused through out al Countries and extēded to al ages: And seing the Catholike Romain Church in this sense is Catholike she only is the Church of Christe: the Church of the Reformers (which was neuer receued in all Countries, nor euer was seen or heard of in any age then this present age, and in the countries and age also in which it floriseth, is not one and the same) is not Catholike, but a par-

*new sect, and the members of it are sectaries and Heretikes.*

SOTCLIFF.

*NOw who seeth not that this toucheth the Papists in general, that restreining the selues with in the Romish Church follow the Popes sect &c. The Monkes also and Fryars follow the rules of their seueral Sectes without seeking whether they lead them.* pag. 32.

KELLISON.

1. THis Souldiour is so eagre in striking that he neglecteth to defend him selfe, and although he hath therfore receued many a broken pate, yet stil hee cõmittes the same fault. I haue proued by reason, Scripturs, and fathers, that the Church of Christe is *Catholike*, and I haue demõstrated that his Church is not *catholike*, but rather a particuler Sect: and this blovve though it hath dravvn bloud on him, hee vvardes not: only like *vvill Sommer* he strikes at mee, saying, *that this toucheth the Papists in General that followv the Popes Sect.* But suppose by this blovv he could hurt vs, yet this vvill not defend him selfe, nor proue his ovvn Church Catholike. Nether is this to answer my argumẽts by vvhich I haue pro-

ued that his Church is not Catholike. As for the blovves vvhich he reacheth at vs, they are so vveake, that they would not kil a Flea: I meane his arguments, vvhich are also already answered. For I haue shevved aboue in the third chapter, how ye Catholike *Romain Church*, is noe particuler sect, & hovv to be linked to the Church of *Rome*, hath euer been a marke of a good Christian: bicause that Church taught euer the truth, as being nearer the Head and fountane, and the faith of that Church, hath euer been the vniuersal faith of the Christian vvorld. there also I haue told him, and had told him before in my Survey, that *monkes* and *fryars* make a distincte order in manner of living, but not in beleeuing. for they beleeue the same that al other Christians doe, and therfore vvere neuer esteemed heretikes, neuer condemned by any Councel, neuer put by S. *Irenæus* or *S. Iustinus martyr*, or *Tertullian*, or *Epiphanius*, or S. *Austin*, or any father, in the *Catalogue* of heretikes, yea S. *Austin* and many of the fathers vvere them selues monkes and Religious. Certes, if to obserue a diuers discipline and rule of life, vvere sufficient to make men heretikes, then al the Colleges in *Oxford* and *Cambridge* and the *Innes of Court*

are so many sectes, and the fellowes of these howses, are Sectaries and heretikes, bicause they obserue certayne statutes ordained by the *Founders*, and keep a certain rule of life, distinct from others.

2. They answer commonly, which yet *Sore.* had not the wit to alleage, that the Church is called *Catholike*, not of the places or ages which it possesseth, but of the doctrine which bindeth al: and this to be taken for true and Catholike, if it be conformable to scripture. but thus *Catholike*, is no marke of the Church bicause markes ought to be deare and manifest, and yet is it as obscure whether any doctrine bee consonant to scripture, as which is the right meaning of scripture, which is most obscure. yea thus the gap is layed open to al heretikes, who euery one, wil thus proue them selues Catholikes, bicause they will say that they teach, conformably to scripture: and you shal hardly proue the contrarie, they opposing scripture to scripture, and their owne exposition to your exposition. Wherefore both scriptures and fathers, by me alleaged, by *Catholike*, vnderstand a Church and faith, that filleth so many places, that it may be sayed to be planted euery where. *Aggeus* foretelleth *that the*

Vvalther. mean by Catholike.

Perkins in Problem. pag. 237.

Vvhat is Catholike.

Agg. 2. glorie of the last Temple, shalbe greater then that of the first: vvhich though it be literally vnderstood of the material Temple vvhich vvas built by *Herod*, bicause that vvas made more glorious then Salomons Temple, by the presence of the *Messias*, the veritie of al the figures, yea, as *Ribera* proueth out of *Iosephus*, in building it vvas more glorious: yet S. *Austin* vnderstandeth it of the Church of Christ (as in the *Allegorical* sense it is to be vnderstood) which was more glorious then the *Synagogue*. God promited also to *Abraham*, that *in his seed*, that is in Christe, (for so S. *Paule* expoundeth it) *al gentils shal blessed*. And God by Dauid saith that *he vvil giue to Christe al Gentils for his inheretaunce*. vvherfore til *Sotc.* can shevv, hovv his Church is more glorious then the Synagogue of the Iewes, (as he shal neuer doe, bicause the Synagogue dured from the departur of the Israelites out of *Ægypt*, vnto the coming of Christe, and had a Succession of Priests, and Princes maugre al the vvarres and captiuities, vvhervvith she vvas scourged, and vvas so famous and cõspicuous, that the Romaines made a league vvith her and receued her Ambassadours: vvheras *Sotcliff* can shevve no monumẽt of his Church in former ages,

Ribera in c. 2. Agg.

li. 18. ciuit. c. 45. 48.

Gen. 22. Gal. 3. Psal. 2.

no succession of this Kinges, and Bishops) I can not take his Church for the church of Christe, especially seing that euē to this day, since God hath giuen ouer the Iewes, & for these 1600. yeares they haue possessed more places, then the reformers novv doe, and haue retained a certain succession, and haue had their Rabbins and Synagogues, and stil liue in the eye of the vvorld: vvheras the reformers, though they novv possess diuers places, yet are not the same sect in any one countrie, scarsely, in one citie, and their stāding is not yet of an 100. yeares: only the *Catholike Romain Church*, hath been, and still is more Glorious in Temples, Priests, Kinges, publike seruice, and al Churchely splendour. And til he can shevv me hovv the *Benediction of al nations* is fallen on his congregation (as he neuer can, bicause it must contein al nations before on it can fal a Benediction of al nations) I can not take it for the Church of Christe. only the Catholike Romain Church is capable of this benediction bicause that euer, & only, hath cōteined yea cōuerted al nations. I say euer, bicause euen in the first beginning of this Church and vvhilest it vvas yet confined in *Hierusalem*, there vvere of al nations conuerted by *saint*

Sot. Church, inferior to the Iewes Synagogue.

Act. 2. Rom. 10. Peters sermon, and soone after the noice of the Apostles voices, sounded ouer al the vvorld, and thousandes in al places resorted to the Church at the sound of these belles and trompets. *In Iustinus* martyr his tyme about the yeare 140. this Church vvas so dilated, that he vvas not afrayd to say, that there was no people nor natiō so Barbarous, *inter quos per nomen crucifixi Iesu, supplicationes et gratiarum actiones Patri Fabricatori rerum omnium non fiant*, amongest vvhom by the name of the crucified Iesus, supplications and thankesgiuinges are not made to the Archi-tect of al. Irenæus liuing about the same tyme affirmeth that in many Countries, of spaine, Libia, Ægypt, the East, vvere then many languages, but yet one faith. *Tertullian*, vvho in the beginning of the third age liued vnder the Popes *Eleutherius* (vhho sent preachers to our *Britannie*) and *Victor*: telles the Pagānes, that Christians then filled their *Cities, Ilands, Castles, pallaces, Senates, Courts, and only left their Temples to them selues*, so many (saith hee) vvee are, that to leaue you, is to ouercome you. Yea hee saith that al natiōs, as *Parthians, Medes, Ælamites, Mesopotamians, Armenians, Phrygians, Cappadocians, the Inhabitants of Pontus, Asia, Pamphilia*, Ægiptiās, Romains

Dial. cum Triphone. supra. Apol c 37 Lcont. Iudæos c. 7. 8.

mans, in Hierusalem receiued first this faith: vvhose examples the people of *Gerulia*, the *Moors*, *Spanyards*, diuers countries of Fraunce then called *Gaule*, and the *Britain Ilands*, vnaccessible to the *Romanes*, ye *Sarmatias*, *Danes*, *Germanes*, *Scythians* & landes vnknovvn, did then render them selues subiectes to Christe and his lavv. Yea hee auoucheth, that Christes Kingdome vvas then greater and more ample then the Kingdome of *Salomon*, who raigned from *Bersabee* to *Dan*, yea then the Kingdome of *Darius* vvho commaunded the *Babilonians* and *Parthians*, then *Pharoes Ægipt*, then *Nabuchodonosors* Empire, vvhich reached from *India* to *Æthiopia*: yea the *Alexanders* vvorld, vvhich he cõquered: because, saith he, there vvere certain bounds of their Empires; but Christes Kingdom and name reacheth to al partes, is euery where beleeued, euery where adored. And by this amplenes of Christs Church and Kingdome, vvhich vvas promised *to dominere from Sea to sea*, and to be the place in which al nations should be blessed, S. *Austin* still disprooueth the Church of the *Donatists* confined vvithin the straites of *Africa*. Supra. Psal. 71. to. 7 li. 3. cont. lit. Petil. l. de vnit. Eccl.

3. Daniel saith that he savv a stone (Christe) *cut from the mountain*, (Marie) *vvithout* Dan. 2.

handes, that is the help of mans seed, and that *this stone beame a mountain which filled al the earth.* Hovv greevv this stone (Christe) so great as to fill al the earth? not in his natural but in his mystical body, which is the Catholike Church, filling al the vvorld. Tovv^ch S. Aug. mac. 1. in ep. Ioan. *Austin* alludeth thus: *what is there so manifest as an Hil? but there are also vnknown Hilles, because they are in one only place of the Earth, but not so că it be sayd of this Hil, because it shalbe an Hil in the topp of Hilles, and al nations shal flovv vnto it.* So that the Church is an Hil which filleth the vvorld, and so can not but be knovvn to al, and such is the Catholike Romain Church. But *Sotcliffes* Church neuer filled the vvorld, and before *Luther*, euen by the cõfession of *Luther*, the *Magdeburgians*, *Caluin* and the Apollogie of Ingland: it vvas so litle a Hillock, and mold Hill, that it could hardly bee seen, or not al: and novv being at the Greatest grough, is not so bigge, as to fill fully one countrie, one lãd, one *Canton*, noe not one Citie, being not one and the same, in any one citie: and yet our Church, is in euery countrie, yea citie, in vvhich any sect of theirs is, but their sectes are not euery vvhere, vvhere our Church is bicause it is farre more Ample. Thus *S. Au-*

Supra. fol. 40. 1. g. 2. & fol. 41.

l. de vnit Eccl. ca. 3.

stin refuted the Donatists of his tyme, yea and Eunomians, and al other heretikes: *Singule hereses in multis gentibus vbi Ecclesia est non multuntur, &c.* Euerie heresie is not in many countries vvhere the Church is, but the Church vvhich is euery vvhere, is also vvhere they are. l. de Pastor. c. 8.

And again: *heretici sunt oues errantes super faciem terræ, nō quidem omnes heretici super omnem terram. &c.* Heretikes are sheep vvandring vpon the face of the earth: but not al heretikes ouer the vvholle earth, but some here, some theare, one sect in Africa, another in the East, another in Ægipt, another in Mesopotamia: so in diuers places are diuers heresies: but our one mother the Catholike Church, hath al Christians which are diffused through the vvholle vvorld. for example: ther is in Africa the Parte of Donat, the Eunomians are not in Africa, but vvith the Parte of Donat there is the Catholike Church in Africa: In the East are the Eunomians, the part of Donat is not there, but vvith the Eunomians, the Catholike Church is to be found. For the Catholike Church is like a vine vvhich by growing is spread euery vvhere, these heretikes are as vnprofitable braunches cut of by the hooke of the Husbandman, and vvhere they are cut of, there they remain, and could not increase, but the Cath. Church, like a vine spreading it selfe ouer al, knovves her euil braunches vvhich haue

remained in her, that is euil Christians, and she hath lying by her the braunches which were cut of from her, that is heretikes. The same say I of the sects of this tyme: for they are in many, but not in al countries, as the Catholike Romain Churche is: nether are al these sectes in euery countrie, but in *Scotland* the *Puritanes* rule the roste: in *England*, the *Protestauntes* though not they only: In one *Canton* of *Germanie* the *Lutheranes* flourish, in another the *Zuinglians*: in *Fraunce* are nether *Lutheranes* nor *Zuinglians*, but only *Calumnists*: in *Spain* and *Italie*, and in the conuerted *Indies*, are none of them, but in al these countries and many moe, the Catholike Church like a vine hath spread her selfe, and like a tree, as *Dauid* foretold, *extended her bowes from Sea to Sea*.

Psal. 71.

4. I conclude then that the Catholike Romain Church, is the Second Temple, more glorious the the first, it is the Church in which al Gentils are blessed, it is the ample Kingdome, it is the Hil that filleth the world; it is the tree that reacheth from sea to sea, and the vine spread ouer al the world, and so the Church of Christ: *Sotcliffes* Church is not so Glorious a Temple as the Synagogue, it is to straite to conteine the benediction of al nations, only it is capable

The conclusion.

of the malediction of some partes and Cantons: it is no ample Kingdom, but a litle hold and sconse of rebels, it is noe great hill to see, but an Hillock to stumble at: it is no ample tree, but a riuen bough, no vine but a braunch cut of, noe body but a parte: and so noe Church of christ, yea to giue Christe Sotcliffes Churche, is to disgrace his inheritaunce, and to dishonour Christe, and his faith also, whose odour, so few and so latelie, that is, not before Luther, haue followed and imbraced.

## The somme of the eight Chapter.

*It hath alwayes been the custome of the Church when any rebellious heretikes arose, to assemble her forces in Generall Councels, and by common sentence to cõdemne them, and by this sentence the Church euer got the victorie and subdeued her enemies: in so much that they haue euer been esteemed and eschewed for heretikes, who by Generall Councels, and by that Church which was commonly taken for the Church before the rising of these heresies, was holden for the true Church: but the Ghospellers of this tyme were condemned by the Generall Councel of Trent, called by that Church which before Luther was counted the true Church and still is commonly so esteemed, ergo they are heretikes.*

SOTCLIFFE.

Pag. 31. THis doth no lesse touch his holy Father then the rest. for contrarie to the form of the Nicen Councel can 4. he giueth libertie to Abbots to consecrate Bishops &c.

KELLISON.

NOT *Tigre* so ful of crueltie towards others, vvhich doth not loue him selfe and his youngones, *Sotcliff* is al hatred and choller, only seeking to hurt others, but not to saue or defend him selfe and his Church. I had proued him an heretike, bicause he is condemned by a Generall Councel, he answereth not one vvord to this (O hovv litle charitie beares he to him self) but only saith, that this toucheth the *Pope* our Holy Father: and so if he may hurt him, he cares not what hurt him selfe receaueth. But peraduenture furie makes him forget his office, vvhich is to answer, not to obiect. vvhat soeuer the cause is, I pardon him, bicause necessitie excuseth him. for vvhat should the poore man answer? what can he plead against the sentence of a *Generall Councel*, assembled by that Church which is commonly called the Christian Church,

and by the authoritie of the Pope vvho was euer counted the head of the Church, and can proue him selfe the lavvfull succeſſor to *S. Peter*, as aboue is declared? Should he anſvver that *General Councels* confirmed by the cheefe paſtour may erre? I haue proued a- Fol. 81.
boue the contrarie. And if a *General Councel* pag.
may erre, much more may *Sorel.* and his *National Councel.* Vvhy then ſhould not *Sorel* be taken rather for an heretike, becauſe the Councel hath pronounced him for one, then for a good Chriſtian, becauſe he him ſelfe or his national councel affordeth him that honour? Should he anſvver that the *General Councel of Trent* defined contrarie to ſcriptur and ſo is not to be credited? But vvhy ſhould vvee not credit a General Coũcel, which telleth vs that your doctrine is contrarie to ſcriptur and that you therfore are heretikes, rather thẽ your ſelues ſo few and ſo ſcattred, vvho ſay that not you, but the Councel diſſenteth frõ ſcriptur? Should he anſvver that this councel vvas not lavv- full? The Biſhops of that Coũcel were law- full paſtours, vvho could proue their miſ- ſion, vocation, ordination, and authoritie, as vvel as the Biſhops of the *Nicen*, or Con- ſtantinopolitan, or Calcedon, or Epheſin.

Councel, vvhich neither *Sotcliff*, nor his Ministers can do; and therfore they vvere a lavvful Councel, these men can not bee. Breefly, thus al heretikes can say, and haue sayd to vvit, that the councel vvhich condemned them, erred, or defined contrarie to scriptur, or vvas not lavvfull, not consisting of true and lavvful Bishops; and yet because they vvere condēned by that councel vvhich consisted of ordinarie Pastours, and vvas assembled in that Church, vvhich before those heretikes flocked together, vvas called and counted the only Church: they vvere presently after the sentence pronounced, holden for heretikes, & vvere shunned of euery good Christian as infected and infecting infidels. So that *Sotcl.* hauing noe more to alleage for him selfe then th'old heretikes had, to vvit scriptur sensed as he and his think good, nor producing noe more against the generall councel of Trent, thē those heretikes might do, and did also, against the ancient Councels if vvee receue *Sotcliff* for a good Christian, and cleare him from hæresie: vvee call in question al the ancient Councels: and their condēnatorie sentēces pronounced against the ancient heretikes must al be reuersed.

But bicause our Minister can not answere to this argument, he seekes to turn it vppō vs, though very absurdly: for I make it a marke of an hæretike to bee condēned by a general Councel, he produceth no Coūcel which hath been assembled to condemne vs as I haue against him, and haue proued also that al they who haue been so condemned are heretikes: but only he saith, that wee hold particuler doctrines contrarie to certain councels assembled against ancient heretikes: which is not the marke wher with I grimed him, but another marke, and that not so euident as myne. for although he be an heretike that holdeth against a General councel, yet it is not alwayes so euident, that an opinion is diffonaunt to a councel, bicause many tymes the councels definition is not so easilie cleared: yet easie it is to know when any by name are by a councel cōdemned, or when a councel is assembled against heretikes in particuler. but how doth he proue, that wee hold against a General councel? *the Pope* (saith he) *contrarie to the forme of the Councel of Nice c. 4. giueth libertie to Abbots to consecrate Bishops, and contrarie to the 5. canon absolueth those that are excommunicated by other Bishops, contrarie*

*to the 6. canon, he inuadeth the dioceses of other Patriarches, contrarie to another order, he separateth Priests from their vvines.* And vvhat if I proue that our minister hath pronounced contrarie to truth in al these points? To the first then I answere, that the Pope giueth no leaue to Abbots not Bishops, to cõsecrate Bishops. & so this proceeded only from his vvonted audacitie in pronouncing. To the second I answer that the Pope doth not easilie absolue him vvho is excõmunicated by his ovvn proper Bishop, but only then when after the appellation of the partie, and other information, he perceueth that his Bishop hath done him vvrong. Vvherfore in the same canon, order is taken to celebrate Synods, vvhich may examin the Bishops sentence, that the cõdemned haue no vvrong. The same is decreed in the *Councels* of *Antioch*, and *Sardis*. and so if one vvrongly condemned may appeal to a synod of the neighbour Bishops, or to the Metropolitane, vvhy not to the Pope the Bishop of Bishops? I graunt that appellations are not easilie to be admitted, for so the Bishops authoritie shalbe mispriſed, and the iustly cõdemned, shal often tymes go scotfree, because they may deceue the Metropolitan

Auſvver to certain Canons obiected.

11. q. 3 cap. Si quis. cap. Si Episcopus. cap seruetur ista Bern. l. 3 de consid.

or Pope, who being farr of, can not so easilie see al circõstances: and this only S. *Ciprian*, & S. *Bernard* meane, vvhen they speake against appellations. othervvise to condemne absolutly appellations, is as badd as to admitt them to easilie. vvherfore vvee read of many appellations made to the Pope and receaued by him. As *Athanasius* condemned by the Eastern and Arian Bishops appealed to *Pope Iulius* the first, S. *Chrysostom* to *Innocentius* the first, *Flauianus* to *Pope Leo*: And this appellation the aforesayd councel of *Sardis* approueth. To the third I answere (as hath been answvered an 100. tymes) that that 6. *Canon*, æqualiseth not the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* to the Bishop of *Rome* nether doth it exempt that Patriarchship from his iurisdictiõ, but only decreeth, that *Ægipt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*, and the Churchies there, are to acknowledge subiectiõ to the *Patriarch* of *Alexãdria*, *quia & urbis Romæ Episcopo parilis mos est*: *bicause it is the like custome of the Bishop of Rome*, to wit, ether so to haue graunted him that prærogatiue: or else, to haue povver also ouer his ovvn Bishops that is ouer al Bishops. Vvherfore *Pope Nicholas* the first vseth these vvordes to *Michael* th Emperour: *The Nicen Councel knevvy*

Cipr. l. 1. ep. 3. 4.

Ex Zozo. l. 3. ca. 7. Ath. in 1. Apol. Chry. ep. ad Innocent. Liberat. in Breuiar. c. 12. Conc. Sard. can. 4. & 7.

d. 65. cap. mos antiquus.

Nich. ep. ad Michael. Imp.

al to be graunted by our lords word vnto the Romain Church: If al, then nothing was wanting, which he graunted not vnto it. finally if the decrees of the Nicen Synod be diligently looked vpon, it will be found, that the same Synod gaue no increase to the Romain Church, but rather that from her forme, the Synod tooke particularly example, what it should giue to the Church of Alexandria. And certes the appellation of Athanasius to *Pope Iulius*, S. *Chrysostome* to *Innocentius*, and *Flauianus* to *Pope Leo*, and the Popes absolution of them, argueth that the Pope had authoritie ouer those Patriarches and their Churches, and that they acknowledged no lesse. yea S. *Leo* his Epistles in which he represseth the pride of *Anatolius Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, who vsurped the rights of the Church of *Alexandria*, do argue, that S. *Leo* thought him selfe to haue authoritie ouer the Church of *Constantinople*. To the last I answer, as aboue, that Priests from the beginning were ether vnmarryed, or such as abstained from their wiues which they had married before holy orders: and this custome was alwayes obserued in the Occidental Church, though in the Oriental Church after S. Hieroms tyme the Grecian Priests began to vse their wiues which

Supra.

Leo ep. 53. 54. 55. 56.

aboue chap. 1. fol. 96.

they had marryed before their ordination, and had permission also of the Romain church. And so the Pope forbidding Priests marriage, or vse of their former wiues, doth contrarie to no order taken in the first *Councel* of *Nice*, bicause that councel forbiddeth Priests all company of vvomen *sauing their mother, or Sister, or Aunte, or such as are free from all suspicion*: such as are not Priests former vviues, for their cõpany is most suspicious. According to this, the 2. *Councel* of carthage commaundeth *Priests and deacons to be continent*. and *Innocentius the first* giues this reason, bicause if the Priests of the old lavv to vvhom vviues vvere permitted to propagate the Tribe of Leui, the only Priestly tribe, abstained in their turnes: much more ought Priests novv, *from the day of their ordination, keepe Chastitie, vvhose priesthood is without Succession, and is not free one day from diuine Sacrifices and Baptism.*

Conc. Nic. can. 3. & d. 33. cap. Interdixit.

Conc. Carth. ca. 2. & d. 31. cap. Episcopos. Innoc ep. 1. ca. 9. d. 31. cap. Tenete.

3. And this shal suffice for the defence of this second booke, and the markes, by vvhich I haue proued *Sotel:* and his consortes heretikes: novv therfore I might come to the defense of my third booke, but that *Sotcliffe* stayeth mee vvith an *Appendix* and addition of markes, deuised by him selfe, to

proue catholikes to be heretikes: vvhich his markes though he haue placed before his answere to my markes: I haue reserued for this place, and for the reason vvhich I haue yeelded in the beginning of my defense of this Second booke.

Supra fol. 88. pag. 1.

## AN ANSVVER TO SOTcliffes Appendix or Addition, in vvch he setteth dovvn markes to proue Catholikes to be heretikes.

### Sotcliffes first marke.

*First Heretikes are vvont to teach nevv doctrine.* Hæresi deputatur (*saith Tertullian* lib. de præscript.) quod postea inducitur. *But such is the Decretaline and Trent-Doctrine of traditions, Iustification, Sacraments, Purgatorie, Indulgences, vvorship of Images, Angels, and Saints.*

### Kellison.

OVr Minister not knovving hovv to auoid the markes by vvhich I haue branded him for an heretike, hath deuised markes of his ovvn inuention, by vvhich he endeuoureth to mark

Catholikes vvith the ſame caracter: that if he can not eſcape our markes, he may at leaſt eſcape our mockes: vvho ſhal haue litle cauſe to vpbraid him vvith that, of vvhich our ſelues are alſo guilte. And his firſt marke, is the ſecõd marke vvhich I haue faſtned on him, to vvit noueltie in doctrine. *To teach nevv doctrine* (ſaith he) *is the very marke of an heretike.* I graunt this your *maior propoſition*, and I haue proued it at large in the ſecond chapter of this ſecond booke, and therby haue concluded you and your fellovv miniſters, to be heretikes: but vvher as you adde, *but ſuch is the Decretalin and Trent doctrine* (ſee vvhat nevv vvordes he coyneth) *of Traditions, Iuſtification, Sacraments, Purgatorie, &c.* I deny that your Aſſumption, as eaſilie as you affirme it, though not ſo boldly: bicauſe I haue partely proued partely ſhal proue, al thoſe pointes of doctrine, not to be *Trent* nor *Decretaline doctrine* only, but diuine and Apoſtolical, and ſo no nevv but ancient doctrine: you nether haue, nether can proue the contrarie, and ſo are to raſh in affirming, vvhere no proofes are brought to confirme.

Aboue chap. 2. booke 2.

## Sotcliffes ſecond marke of heretikes.

*Secondly they ſly the light of Scriptures, and ſpeake euil of them &c. and do not the Papiſts fly Scripture, forbidding them to be read publikely in vulgar tongues &c. do they not alſo ſay that Scripture are like a noſe of vvaxe, vvas Kelliſon ſaith, vvaxe, and that they depend vppon the Church &c.*

1. MArkes being to notifie and to distinguish one thing from another, ought not to be common, but proper, and proper *quarto modo*: and yet is this our Deanes marke proper *nullo modo*. For nether do only heretikes fly Scriptures, bicause Ievves also do fly the nevv Testament, and the Paganes do fly both old and nevv: nether do al heretikes fly al scripturs. The *Manichies* in deed, and before them, the *Marcionites*, *Basilidians* and *Simonians* denyed the old Testament: *Swenkfeldius* and the *Libertins* reiected al scripturs and vvould stick only to the spirit: others haue discanoned one parte, others another part of scripturs, yet fevv or none besides those vvhom I haue named, haue denyed al scriptur, and some haue denyed no booke of scripture. Yea as I haue aboue declared, heretikes do commonly glorie in scriptur, and do alleage them also to grace and colour their heresies: and so *flying of Scriptur*, is no fit marke to Knovv an heretike by. Or if it be, it proueth *Sote:* an heretike, bicause he and his fellovv-faith fulles, haue denyed amongest them, many bookes of scriptur, as the epistle to the *Hebrevves*, of S. *Iames*, and S. *Iudas*, the bookes of *Iudith*, *Tobie*, *Iob*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and the *Machabees*: and so if the afore-said heretikes vvere so censured for denying those bookes vvhich that Societie vvhich vvas commonly counted the true Christian Church receued, then *Luther*, *Caluin*, and their complices, must needs bee heretikes for denying the

Ex Iren. li. 1. c. 10. 22. 29. Epiph. her. 66. Ex Staph. Concord. & Calu. cont. Libert. c. 9.

l. 1. chap. 1.

the aforesaid bookes, holden for canonical by the Catholike Romain Church, vvhich is, and euer vvas generally, euen by Ievves and Paganes, holden for the Christian Church.

1. As for Catholikes, they vvith no shevv, can be noted vvith this Marke (if it vvere a marke) bicause looke vvhat canonical bookes *Sotcliff* and his brethern receue, those do Catholikes receue, and many moe, vvhich thei reiect: and looke vvhat bookes vvere euer holden by the Church for canonical, those Catholikes do reuerence for the vvord of God: as appeareth by the third Councel of Carthage, and the Councel of Trent, vvhich do both recken and reuerence al the bookes canonical. And vvheras *Sotcliffe* alleageth *Ireneus*, by me præalleaged, to proue that Heretikes do fly scriptures, I answer, that *Ireneus* speaketh not of al but of some heretikes, to vvit the Gnostickes, vvho vvhen they vvere conuinced by Scripturs denyed, them as our aduersaries for the same cause haue denyed the aforesayd bookes: and fained certain Traditions not allovved by the Church but deuised by then selues, to authorize their Phantasies disallovved by scriptur, as I shal declare in *Sotcliffes* fift marke.

Cõc. Carthag. 3. c. 74
Cõc. Trid Sess. 4.
Iren. l. 3. c. 2. pag. 85. edit. 1.

3. But tell vs, Good Sir, hovv can you discern an heretike by *flying Scripturs*? Certes to knovv vvhen an heretike denyeth scriptur, it is necessarie first, to knovv vvhich bookes are Scriptur: and hovv knovv you this? by Scriptur? In no place of scriptur cã you find that these bookes are scripture, and if you could, yet vvere not that

sufficient: for I would aske how you know that booke, which sayeth so, to be scriptur? by your spirit? that is as obscure as scripture: and as your spirit telles you (if you haue Caluins spirit) that *S. Iames* his *Epistle* is scriptur, so *Luther* saith that his spirit hath otherwise inspired him. by Tradition? that, as you say in your fift marke, is a marke of an heretike. And by what Tradition, and of what Church? of the Catholike Romain Church? then as you beleeue the tradition of this Church for *S. Paules* Epistle to the Romains, so must you beleeue it for *S. Iames* his Epistle, and for many other thinges, the authoritie being one and the same. By Tradition of your own Church? Shew vs first I pray you where your Church was before *Luther*, *Farel*, and *Caluin*, and name vs the congregation, which by tradition from hand to hād kept these bookes and deliuered them to *Luther*.

3. Now if *Sotcliff* by *Flying of Scriptur*, vnderstād not, denying of them, but only ill expounding them, besides that he speaketh very improperly, neither so is *Flying of Scriptur*, a fit note to know an heretike. Because markes ought not only to be proper, but also euidēt, else they can not bring vs to the knowledge of the thing marked, and yet is it as hard to know whē an heretike wrongly expoundeth Scriptur, as to know which is the true meaning of Scripture, which is most obscure and hidden. So, this marke serueth only to marke *Sotc.* for an heretike, or a foole, or both.

## Sotcliffes third marke.

*THirdly heretikes teach otherwyse then the Apostles did. Therfore the Apostle* 1. Tim. 1. *gaue order to Timothy that he should charge some that they should not teach otherwyse, &c.*

## KELLISON.

1. THis marke is vvorse then the former, as being not only obscure but also ambiguous, for by teaching othervvise then the Apostles taught, vvee may vnderstand, ether othervvise then they preached and deliuered by *Tradition* to the primatiue Church, and so it marketh *sot:* for an heretike, vvho denieth *Tradition*, and condemneth the ancient Fathers and their bookes of errour or corruption, and cleaueth therfore only to scriptur for assurance, as vve haue seen already and shal see again herafter in the fift marke. Or vve may vnderstand by teaching othervvise then the Apostles taught, teaching contrarie to Scripture, and so it is no marke, bicause it is as obscure to knovv vvhoe teacheth contrarie to scripture, as to expound Scriptur, and therfore the heretike vvil as vvel charge the true Christian vvith teaching othervvise then the Apostles did in Scriptur, as he shal the heretike. And vvho then shal be iudge? not scriptur. bicause scripture interpreteth not her selfe. Not the Spirit, as is already proued, not Tradition, in *Sotcliffes* opinion, as is declared in the former marke: and so this can be no marke, as being so obscure. But, saith our Above fol. 46.

l. præscr. Marker, *Tertulian* demaundeth *vvhence are heretiks straungers and enemies to the Apostles but by reason of the diuersitie of doctrin?* True, but how can you knowe, Maister Marker, when an heretike teacheth a doctrin diuerse from the Apostles? not by scriptur, as is proued. how then? The same *Tertulliã*, in the same booke telleth you, in these wordes, which you would not marke, least they should marke you for an heretike: *quid prædicauerint Apostoli, quid illis Christus reuelauerit, & hîc præscribam, non aliter probari posse nisi per eosdem Ecclesias, quas ipsi Apostoli condiderunt: what the Apostles preached, what Christ reuealed vnto them, here I will præscribe, that it can not be proued otherwise, then by the Churches which the Apostles them selues founded.*

2. Now if we haue recourse to the ancient Churches wee shal synde by the Apostles *Liturgies*, by the writings of their Scholers, *Dionisius Areopagita, Ignatius, Martialis*, and others, that they taught a sacrifice, vse of the sign of the crosse, and other points of Religion, which Catholikes imbrace, and you deny: and therfore the *Magdeburgenses*, & al of you, are forced to deny their bookes, knowing that your Religion can not but fal, they standing. The *Catalogues* also of Bishops in the Apostles Seates, Tradition, which from tyme to tyme and hand to hand hath deliuered the doctrin and practise of the Apostles and their Scholers, and al ancient histories and monuments euen to Churches and Monasteries, will plead for our Religion and against your newe synagogue, of which there was neuer seen any monument,

Democharres de Sacrificio Missæ. Petr. Opmersani. in Catal. omnium Epise.

not heard any mention, before *Luther*.

3. But *Sotcliff* vvould haue vs to try vvhat the Apoſtles taught, by the bare letter of ſcriptur, that ſo, ſcriptur being ambiguous and darke, he might hide his vglie ſhape of an heretike, and run avvay in a clovvd. Vvheras *Sotc.* addeth that Papiſts haue not only *taught otherwiſe then the Apoſtles taught, but haue alſo added much traſh contrarie to their doctrin*, it is as eaſily denyed by vs, as affirmed by him: for although the Church according to the circumſtãces of tyme, haue made nevv lavves for gouernment, and inſtituted ſome ceremonies alſo for the more decent adminiſtration of Sacraments, and hath declared ſome bookes to be canonical vvch before vvere ſo, but vvere not aſſuredly knovvn, yea, and hath in Councels explained doctrines vvhich before in ſubſtaunce vvere holden, yet hath ſhe added in ſubſtaunce no nevv doctrin, much leſſe contrarie doctrin; bicauſe vvhat ſhe teacheth concerning *Purgatorie, Sacraments, Iuſtification, merit, good vvorkes, Real preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, vvorſhipping of Sainctes, and Images, prayer to Saints, and for the dead*, the primatiue Church taught and deliuered, as vve partly haue, partly ſhal proue in their proper places.

## Sotclippes fourth marke.

*Fourthly heretikes ſtand much vppon falſe miracles and prophecies, as the examples both of Montaniſts and Seuerians do ſhovv &c. In vvhich points the Papiſts do follovv them at the Heeles, bragging of the miracles, of*

*Dominick, Francis, Ignatius, Xauier, and other their Romish Saints, and making miracles and prophecies, markes of their Church, and motiues to induce men to like of their Religion.*

## Reason.

1. STil this Minister seeketh for obscure markes, which also in show, may as well be obiected to true Christians as heretikes, that so he may hide himselfe. For although I deny not, but that miracles taken with al their circumstances, as the multitude, the manner of working them, and such like, be a very credible motiue to induce mē to religion, and are not ordinarilie wrought out of the Catholike Church, & so are a very probable mark of the true Church, yet sometymes they are wrought by sinners, yea and infidels also, as appeareth by *Iulian* the *Apostata* his chasing away of deuils by the sign of the crosse this guift being but *gratia gratis data*, not *gratia gratum faciens*: and although true miracles can not be wrought in confirmation of heresie, bicause they being workes which surpasse the force of nature, can not bee wrought but by God, who in that he is the only authour of nature, is only aboue natur, and who being truth it selfe, nether will, nether can worke a true miracle to authorize an vntruth, bicause so he should induce men to errour: yet such is the affinitie betwixt false and true miracles, that it is hard to distinguish them. For *Simon Magus*, *Montanus*, *Maximilla*, and the Gnostickes, deceued many by their illusions, and *Antichrist*, by his

How miracles are a marke.

Mat. 7. Luc. 10. Naz orat. 1. cōt. Iul.

Ex Clem. l. 5 Recog. ex Ignat. l. 3 c. 1. Petr. Apol c. 13.

vvonders, shal seduce many moe: and so false miracles are no good marke of an heretike, bicause markes should be euident, false miracles are obscure. more ouer not al heretikes haue vvrought false miracles, for some haue neuer attempted thé, others haue so failed in the attempt, that they vvere laughed to Scorn, as vvas, *Circle* the Arian, *Manicheus*, yea *Luther* and *Caluin*: and so *Sote.* playes the foole not miraculously but naturally, in making false miracles a mark, vvhich is nether euidét, not common to al heretikes.

& lib. de anima. Aug. her. 1. Iren. l. 1. c. 8 9. 24. Feuard. ibidem. Mat. 24. 2 Thes. 2. Apoc. 13. Ex Greg. Tur. l. 2 c. 3. Epipha. her. 66. ex Staph. & Bolsec.

2. Vvheras *Sotel.* saith that *Papists do follovv heretikes by the heeles in bragging of the miracles of Dominick, Francis &c.* he deserues to be set by the heeles for so saying. for Catholikes bragg not, but yet do glorie in God, for the multitude of miracles, vvhich by those and other saincte haue been vvrought, for the greater glorie of God, & aduancemēt of the truth: vvhich miracles, for *Sot.* to cal in question, vvere not only folly, but meere madnesse. for these miracles are recounted by ancient, learned and holy fathers, as *Saincte Cyprian, S. Athanasius, S. Augustin, S. Gregorie the Great* and of *Tours, S. Bede, S. Bonauentur, S. Antonin*, and others: they are Chronicled by *Eusebius, Russinus Theodoretus, Socrates, Sozomenus, Nicephorus, Metaphrastes*, and others most autentical Historiographers: and the vvholle Christian vvorld hath receued them, and no man durst euer call them in doubte, till *Sotecliffe* and the *Magdeburgians*, & other his nevv maisters, vvho vvill seeme to be vviser then al their forfathers, put on their brazen faces. but behold here

Cipt. l. de lap. Ath. in vita Ant. Aug. l. 22. ciu. c. 8 ot. in Dial. ll. hist. Frãc. l. hist. Angl. Bon. in vita S. Franc. Anton.

the vvit of this man. He vvill credit prophane histories, for vvhich yet he hath the testimonie only of Pagans, and vvil not credit our miracles recounted by Christians, and those so ancient, learned and holy vvriters: and he vvil beleeue that he had a Church, and a succession of Ministers from the Apostles vnto *Luther*, of vvhich there is no mention in historie, nor no monument in antiquitie, and yet vvill not receue our miracles, for vvhich is so great authoritie and so ancient record.

3. If *Sotcl.* answer that he vvil beleeue the miracles recorded by *S. Athanasius*, *S. Cyprian*, *S. Austin*, *S. Gregorie* and others, yet soe, that he vvil haue thé to be the miracles of his Church, he shal shevv him selfe vvorse they mad. For *S. Austen* recounteth miracles vvrought by the Sacrifice of the *Masse*, by Relikes of *S. Stephen*, by SS. *Protasius* and *Gervasius*, by the sign of the Cross, by holy earth of *Hierusalem*, and by prayer to Saintes. *S. Cyprian* telles of miracles vvrought by the blessed Sacrament and for proofe of the real presence. *S. Gregorie*, vvrites of miracles vvrought by the same blessed Sacrament, by *S. Benedict*, and religious men, and by the sign also of the crosse. *Gregorius Turonensis* mentioneth miracles done also by Religious men, by Relikes, by the sign of the cross, and such like. *S. Bede* recordeth miracles done by *S. Austen* the Monk, and his fellovv monkes, by *S. Germanus*, *S. Cuthbert* and others, and that by relikes, holy vvater, praying for the dead, by the sign of the cross &c. Novv that these miracles vvere ours I proue thus. For first they vvere

l. 22. civit. c. 8.

l. de lap.

l. 2. dial. c. 24. l. 3. c. 3. & alibi.

H. hist. Franc.

l. 1. Hist. Ang. c. 31. 18. l. 3. c. 2. l. 2. c. 2. l. 4. c. 22.

vvrought for our Religion, and that I gather out of *Fox*, *Bale*, and *Holinshed*, vvho confesse that *S. Austen* planted in England the Romish religion, vvhich vvas also the ancient Christian Religion of the Britons, they (as S. *Bede* vvitnesseth) differing from S. *Austen*, only in the Obseruation of Easter: and this Religion plated by *S. Austen*, *S. Bede* auerreth to haue been plated by miracles, *multorũ miraculorũ ostensione*. Secondly these miracles vvere vvrought by men of our Religion to vvit mõkes and Religious? Thirdly they vvere vvrought by relikes and the Sacrifice of the Masse, and the sign of the cross, and by holy vvater, and prayer to Saints, and for the dead, vvhich thinges vve imbrace, *Sotcliff* and his detest. I conclude then vvith this dilemma: ether these miracles vvere true or false: if false. then *S. Austen*, *S. Ciprian*, *S. Athanasius*, *S. Gregorie*, and *S. Bede* and others, vvere not only vvriters of lyes, but also lyers, bicause they propose these miracles for true. If true then is our Religiõ true, vvhich God (vvho as before can not vvorke a miracle to authorize an vntruth) hath confirmed by miracles, euen in those points, in vvhich *Sot.* and his ministers do disaggree from vs.

For in Protest pa. 9. Bal. Cent. 1. Hol. c. 17. col. 1.

li 1. Hist. Angl. c. 21.

Beda sup.

## SOTCLIFFES fift marke.

*Fifthly heretikes commonly stand vppon Traditions, as vve may read in Irenæus lib. 3. c. 2. &c.*

## KELLISON.

1. NEther is this marke vvorthy the name of a marke. for ether he vnderstandeth

true, or false Traditions? If true. not heretikes but Catholikes do alleage them; If false. nether so is it a good marke, bicause nether do al heretikes alleage false traditions, but rather Scripturs, as vve haue seen, nether can *Sotcliff* easilie distinguish false Traditions from true. For ether by Scriptur, and that is obscure, or by the Romain Church, and that he vvil not beleeue, or by his ovvn Church, and that can not giue testimonie of ancient Traditions, bicause (as I haue proued aboue in the first chapter of the first booke) it vvas not *in rerum natura* before *Luther*: and therfore hath noe record, nor monument, nor mention in Antiquitie. As for *Ireneus* vvhom *Sotcliff* alleageth to proue that al heretikes do alleage Traditions, he speaketh not of al, but only of the *Gnostickes*, vvho vvhen they vvere conuinced by manifest Scripturs, denyed them, as *Sotcliffes* brethren do, and bragged that they had certain *Traditions*, to authorize their fictions. but vvhat *Traditions*? not autentical but such as vvere forged by them selues. For (as S. Ireneus saith) their Tradition vvas that, *quam à semetipso vnusquisque inuenit*, vvhich euery one deuised by him selfe, and vvhich they called *the vvisdom vvhich S. Paule preached amongest the perfect*. Such vvere those phantastical heretikes, vvho sayd that they Knevv the secrets vvhich S. Paule said it vvas not lavvful for man to vtter. As for *Apostolical*, or *diuin Traditions*, allovved by the Church, those the *Gnostickes* refused, as the heretikes of this tyme do, *Ireneus* receiued. For, saith he, *cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem, quæ est ab Apo-*

L1. cap. 2.

aboue fol. 41.

L3 c. 2.

1. Cor. 2. cap. laudat. Rom. d. 15

L3 c. 2.

*ſtolis &c but vvhen vve prouoke them to that Tradition vvhich is from the Apoſtles, vvhich by ſucceſſiõ of Prieſts is conſerued in the Churches, they oppoſe themſelues to Traditiõ, ſaying that they beeing vviſer not only then the Prieſts but alſo the Apoſtles, haue found out the ſincere truth.* And in the next chapter he hath theſe vvords: *Traditionẽ itaque ab Apoſtolis &c. The Traditiõ frõ th' Apoſtles manifeſted in the vvholl vvorld, may be ſeen in euery Church of al that vvil hear the truth.* So that *Sotcliff* is like the old vvidovv vvho vvas promiſed an husband if ſhe could ſee an egge vppõ the top of the barne: for as ſhe imagined ſhe ſavv the egge though ſhe could not ſee the barne, ſo *Sotcliff* could ſee thoſe fevv vvords in vvch *S. Ireneus* taunteth the *Gnoſticks*, for Flying to falſe Traditions, vvhen they vvere conuinced by Scriptur, and yet could not, or vvould not ſee, or ſeing diſſembleth, ſo many lines in vvhich *Ireneus*, commendeth Apoſtolical Tradition, and by it refuteth the *Gnoſticks*, as Catholikes do novv refute the reformers, for gainſaying, the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, prayer to Saints, prayer for the dead, vvorſhip of Saincts and Images, vſe of the ſigne of the croſs, and ſuch like, vvhich euen from the Apoſtles, haue by Traditiõ been deliuered vnto vs, in ſo much that our aduerſaries can not tell vvhẽ firſt thoſe things vvere receued, and if they name any tyme later then that of the Apoſtles, vve bring thẽ higher: as ſhal appear herafter in the handling of theſe points.

2. As concerning *S. Auſten* by *Sotcliff* alſo alleaged, he ſpeaketh only of certain heretikes and eſpecially of the *Manichees*, (as appeareth by his 97.

Aug. trac. 97. 98. Io. 16.

and 98. tracte vppon Saint Ihon) vvho reading hovv Christe told his Apostles that *he had many things to say to them, vvhich yet they could not carry awvay*, Sayd, that their forged, and secret doctrines, vvere the selfe same things: but as for Apostolical Traditions receued by the Church, he approueth them in the same place & proueth them

Traditiõs proued.

1. Tim. 6. 2. Tim. 2.

out of S. Paule, *depositum custodi*, and inueigheth against *prophane nouelties*, vvith the same Apostle. So that to deny Apostolical Traditions, as *Sotel.* doth, is the badge of an heretike, and to reuerẽce them is the marke of a good Christian. Or if *Sotc.* vvil needs haue it to be a marke of an heretike, he maketh S. *Irenæus*, and *S. Austen*, *Dionisius Areopagita*, *Ignatius*, and *Saint Ciprian* heretikes: yea then *Moyses*, vvas an heretike vvho temitteth vs to former ages and to our Ancesters & forfathers: then *S. Paule* vvas an heretike, vvho biddes vs *hold Traditions*: and (vvhom peraduentur *Sotcliff* feareth more then al these) then *King Iames* our Soueraign, and *Sotcliffes* Bishops also, are al heretikes, be in his conference vvith them at Hampton court, they in their nevv Canons, allovving the vse of the sign of the cros in Baptism, vvhich not scripture, but only Tradition, and Tradition also of the Catholike Romain Church, hath vvaranted.

Iren. supra & l. 3. c. 4. Aug. supr. & l. 28. cõt. Faustũ c. 2. ep. 174 108. 118. l. de cura pro mort. c. 1 4. l. de fide & op. ca. 9. li. de Eccl. dog c. 69. l. 2. de bapt. c. 7. Dion. l. de eccl. hier. Ign. ep. ad Heron. & Phil. Cipr. ep ad Cecil. li. de ablut. ped. Deut. 32. 2. Thes. 2. 1. Cor. 11.

## Sotcliffes sixt marke.

*SIxtly our Sauiour Christ shevveth that false Prophets shal come vnto vs in the habit, and cloaths of sheep, but are inwvardly rauening vvolues. The same vve fynd partly in the Arrians and Donatists, but most expressely in the*

*Papists. For albeit they vvil be called Catholikes and Christs sheep, yet they deuour true Catholikes and massacre them &c. Their Inquisiters Tribunals, are full of bloud of Innocents, and their garments are red vvith blood &c.*

## SOTCLIFF.

THis *Sote* saith, bicause the Catholike Church punisheth heretikes: but I answer as *S. Austen* did to the *Donatists: probent se non esse hereticos, tum demum de indignis pœnis inuidam vocem emittãt, let them proue them selues to be no heretikes, and then let them complain:* For vntil they haue proued that, theeues and murderers may as vvel complain of the Iudges benches, as *Sote.* and his brethren of the *Inquisiters Tribunals.* But see the vvit of this man. he saith Papists are heretikes, bicause vnder the habit of sheep they hide a vvolues crueltie, and yet he saith by & by after, *that their garments are redd vvith blood and carry exudent markes of their crueltie.* Vvhich if it be true then are not Papists the heretikes of vvhich Christ speaketh, bicause they cloake not their crueltie vnder sheeps cloathes, but rather manifest it openly by a vvolues skinne al goarie, vvith the blood of the deuoured sheep. Behold again vvhat a mark this is. Marks should be proper and euident, and yet this, barely taken as *Sote.* taketh it, is like the Shipmans hose, vvhich serueth both legges. For as S. *Austen* sayd *occiderunt impij Prophetas, occiderunt impius & Propheta, the vvicked killed the Prophets, and the Prophets killed the vvicked,* and both vnder the name of Prophets, so say

l. 1. cont. parm. c. 7.

Heretikes may be punished.

ep. 30.

I, Catholikes punish heretikes, and heretikes punish Catholikes, and both vnder the name of Christians. And therfore if he vvil proue Papists to be heretikes, bicause in *King Henries*, and *Queen Maries* tyme, and stil in *Spain*, and *Italie*, they punish his obstinate brethern, and that also vnder the name of Catholikes: I vvil proue him and his fellovves to be heretikes: bicause in *King Edvvards*, and *Queen Elizabeths* tyme, they haue persequuted Catholikes, and still do vvith prisons, rackes, Tiburns, and losse of liuings, and liues, and vnder the name also of reformed Christians. And as vvel might the *Arrians*, haue proued *Constantin* the Great, and the *Councel* of *Nice* heretikes, for banishing and punishing them, vnder the name of Christians, as *Sotc.* proueth Papists to be heretikes for punishing his fellovves, and that vnder the name of Catholikes.

2. If *Sot:* answver that the *Arians*, vvere heretikes and so vvere iustly punished, the same vvil I say of him and his, til he can discharge him selfe and his companions of the marks of heretikes vvith vvhich, in this second book I haue branded him. In the mean tyme, I vvil proue him an heretike out of this place vvhich he alleageth. For there Christ fore-vvarneth vs of false prophets *Vvho shal come disguised in sheeps coats, yet in vvardly are rauening vvolues:* yet he saith not as *Sotcliff* doth, that vve shal Knovv them by their coats, for so they vvil seem to be good sheep, but by their vvorkes and fruits of their doctrin. For as the crabb-tree is distinguished from the good apple-tree, by the sovvernes of the fruicts, so heretical

Mat. 7.

doctrin from Catholike faith, by the euil fruits it beareth. For although a true Catholike may liue the euil life of an heretike, yet that is not the fruict of his faith, but of his frail and corrupt vvil or nature. Vvherfore seing that the nevv religion bringeth princes and their lavves in contempt, openeth the gapp to al vice yea and atheism to (as I haue proued in my Suruey) *Sotcliff* and his companions the professors of it, not vvith stãding their sheeps coates of scripturs, and of ye name *Reformed Christian*, and *Ghospeller*, are rauening vvolues and heretikes. *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, hath another exposition of this place, vvhich also proueth *Sotcliff* an heretike. by the garments of these false Prophets he vnderstandeth the letter of scriptur, vvith vvhich they inuest and couer them selues, by the rauening vvolues, he vnderstandeth peruerse and heretical expositions, vvhich Kill the Sheep of Christ: but saith he, to knovv vvhether these expositions be heretical or noe, you must marke vvhether they breake vnitie, ordissent frõ the interpretation of the Church or fathers, vvhether they be *according to the Traditions of the vniuersal Church and the rules of Catholike doctrin.* To Knovv this, he biddes vs to marke, *vvhether they follovv vniuersalitie, anti quitie, and consent.* For, saith he, if at any tyme, any part or sect rebel against vniuersalitie, noueltie against antiquitie, dissension of a fevv, against the consent of al or the most part, then let vniuersalitie be præferred before the part, antiquitie before noueltie, and consent before dissension. By this exposition *Sotcliff* and his companions are heretikes, and the false Prophets

lib. cont. Prophanas hær. nouit. ca. 37. 38.

Christ speaketh of. For they inuest them selues in scripturs, none alleaging them more then they: but vnder this coat and letter of scriptur, they hide their heresies and heretical interpretations. bicause their interpretations break the vnitie vvhich vvas amongest al Christians before their preaching, and they are opposit to the interpretatiõ of the vniuersal Church, and to the ancient Fathers, as they them selues confess in that they rayl against Fathers and Councels, make their Church a litle and contemptible congregation, bicause it disserteth from the great and vniuersal Church generally receued for the true Church. and so in them, the part oppoſeth it selfe to vniuersalitie, the faction of a fevv against the consent of many, and noueltie against antiquitie, they at their rising, finding none liuing of their opinion, none dead, but damned heretikes, from vvhom also they vvere diuerse in diuers pointes. So *Sotc.* in calling Papists heretikes, doth as theeues do, vvho pointing at honest men, cry, take the theefe, that they in the mean tyme may escape vvhilest those are pursued. for though he cry out, that Papists are false Apostles, and rauening vvolues vnder sheeps coates, yet he & his are in deed the men, if vve giue credit to the text of Scriptur, and the interpretation of S. *Vincentius Lyrinensis.*

2. Hauing proued *Sotcliff* and his fellovves to be heretikes (vvhich in this second booke I proue also by many arguments) it remaineth that I proue that they may be punished, and that consequently *Sotcliff* vvithout reason complaineth of

Papists

Papists seueritie. True it is that *Iohn Huss*, as is related in the Councel of *Constance*, and in his 14. article, likened the Prelats of the Church vnto the *Scribes* and *Pharisies*, vvho sayd that they might not kill any man, and yet deliuered Christ vnto Pilat. *Luther* sayd that to burn heretikes *is against the vvil of the Spirit*. The like vvas the opinion of the *Donatists*; and commonly al heretikes condemne this seueritie, to saue their ovvn skinnes. yet *Caluin*, and *Beza*, vvho vvuld haue sayd so also; if the case had been their ovvn, contrarie to this receued opinió amongst heretiks, causéd and occasioned the death of *Michael Seruetus*, for his heresies. But if I proue it not to be as euidét, that heretiks may be punished temporally, as that theeues and murderers may be hanged, then let them hold vp their hand, and cry not guiltie, hardily. I confess S. *Austin* vvas once of opinion, that against heretikes, the vvord vvas to be vsed not the svvord, persuasion, not compulsion, but after better consideration, and experience of the Imperial lavves vvhich clensed his ovvn citie *Hippo*, from the infection of heresie, he altered his opinion. And vvhy should not heretikes be punished? In the old lavv vvhich vvas a figure of the nevv, false Prophets, vvho persuaded the people to follovv straunge Goddes, vvere stoned to death, and he that vvould not obey the high Priest, vvas to be Killed; and shal the heretike vvho inducéth vs to imbrace straung doctrines, and stubbornly resisteth the High Priest of Christes Church, be spared? For the corporal leprie, the lepre vvas cast

In assert. art. 33. ex Aug. li. 1. cõt. Par. l. 2. cõs lit. Petil. c. 10. ep. 50. l. 2. cont. ep. Gaud. c. 17

Heretikes to be punished.

Aug. ep. 48. & 50.

Deut. 13. 17. 18.

Leuit. 13.

out of the Societie of the Ievves, and shal not the heretike, stricken vvith the spiritual lepresie, be cut of from the mystical body of Christs Church by excommunication, and death also, if that vvill not hinder the infection? The Blasphemer in the same lavv vvas cast out of the Tents, ignominiously, and brained to death vvith stones: & shal the heretike alvvayes in hart incredulous, and most commonly, in vvords blasphemous, and in deeds sacrilegious, be stroked on the head and cherished? The adulterer and Homicide vvere put to death, & shal the heretike that Killeth and defloureth the soule, go scotfree? those infamous Schismatikes, *Chore*, *Dathan*, *Abiron* and *Hon*, for arrogating vnto them *Aarons* office, vver svvallovved by the earth; & shal the heretike of this tyme, vvho giueth to lay men, that vvere nether ordained nor called rightly (as before is proued) the office of Gods Priests, escape the punishmēt due to such preposterous arrogancie? If Christ vvhipped out, the prophaners of the Temple; If S. *Peter* stroke dead *Ananias* & his vvife; If S. *Paule* stroke blind, *Elymas* the Magicien; and deliuered the Incestuous to Satan: vvhy shal heretikes be spared, vvho prophane Churches, yea, as much as in the lyeth, the vvholl Church of God, vvho ly to the holy Ghost as *Ananias* did, hinder the vvord of God and conuersion of soules as *Elymas* did, and commit as much as in them lyeth spiritual incest, vvith their mother the Church, seeking to violate her integritie? Noe, noe, Sir *Sotcliff*, an heretike, as you are, is a *vvolfe*, *ergo* to be driuen from

Leuit. 24.

Leuit. 20.

Num. 16.

Lu. c. 1.

Io. 2.

Act 5.

Act. 13.

1. Cor. 5.

Mat. 7. & Io 10.

thefold, vvith ſtones & clubbes: he is a *theefe, ergo*, to be hãged: he is a *Cankr, ergo* to be cured or kilſed he is a clipper and falſe coyner, that is a deprauer of Chriſts vvord, *ergo* to be hanged, dravvn and quartered: he is an infected member, *ergo* to bee cut of, leaſt he infect the vvholl body: hee is a rotten bovvg, *ergo* fit fevvel for the fier: he is *tockle, ergo* to be pluckt vp by the roote, leaſt he hinder the grough of the good vvheat: he is no part but a corrupt humour in the body of the Church, *ergo* to be purged and expelled. Io. 10. 2. Tim. 2. l. 1. 2. 3. de falſa mo. neta. Mat. 13.

3. And not only Scriptur, but reaſon alſo grounded in faith, cõdemneth al ſtubborn heretikes to temporal puniſhment. For heretikes in baptiſm by the Church and their Godfathers, promiſed the obſeruaunce of the Chriſtiah lavv, and therfore if Pupilles ought to ſtand to that, vvhich their Tutors did or promiſed in their name, much more ought the baptiſed vvhen they come to yeares of diſcretion, perfourm the promiſes made for them in baptiſme, they being not to their preiudice, but as much to their profit as is their eternal ſaluation. Again he that is born in a countrie is bound to the lavves and is a ſubiect and member of the Kingdom by right of natiuitie: vvherfore ſeing that an heretike by baptiſm, as by a ſpiritual natiuitie and incorporation, vvas once a member of the Church, and yet is a ſubiect *de iure*, by reaſon of his *caracter*, he is bound to the lavves of Chriſte and his Church, and conſequently, it is not in his choiſe (as *Eraſmus*, and *Ludouicus Viues* ſayd) to obſerue or not obſerue the Chriſtian lavv, but he is Reaſon proueth heretikes puniſhment. Eraſm. in Paraphr. in Mat.

Iud. in l. 1. de ciuit. c. 27. bound thervnto by promise, natiuitie, and incorporation, and if he disobey or rebelle, he may by the Church and her pastours be punished: else vvere the Church (vvhich yet is the most eminent state that is) inferiour to the lovvest common vvelth, and vvorse vvere the condition of this mystical body of Christ, then of a politike or ciuil body, for this may punish rebelles and malefactours: yea vvorse vvere the state of Christs mystical body then of mans natural body, vvhich hath authorite to expel by purgatiō, a malign humour, or to cut of an infected member, least it infect the vvholl body. This Plato vvithout the light of faith could see, and therfore commaunded that children comming to yeares of discretion, should by pain of death, be enforced to the *Ceremonies* and *Sacrifices* of the common vvealth.

lib. 10. de leg.

Ioseph. l. 2. cont. Appion. And *Ioseph* in his second book against *Appion*, mentioneth the like lavves of the *Græcians*, *Scythians*, and *Persians*. But *Sot*: vvil say that faith is free, and so not to be forced. And vvhy then do he and his fellovves in ingland vse so violent and bloudy courses to enforce Catholikes to take their oathes of *Supremacie*, and to svveare *euen from the hart vvithout al mental restriction?* Vvhy do they compell them to frequent their Churches, supper, and preach? But to answer him more directly, I graūt that faith is free from invvard necessity and cōstraint, bicause it depēdeth on the vvil (vvhich only God can necessitate, none can compel) but not from necessitie of lavv. for as the vvil is Subiect to lavv and præcept in moral actions, and the ten commandements, yea and commandements of

Princes and Superiours, and muſt of neceſſitie keep them vnleſſe ſhe vvil ſinne: ſo are al Chriſtians bound by neceſſitie of precept, to beleeue as Chriſt hath commaunded and reuealed to his Church: and if they ſtubbornly refuſe, they may bee puniſhed, as other tranſgreſſors may. In vvch no man is compelled invvardly to beleeue, becauſe it is in his free choiſe, but only is conſtrained to abide the due puniſhement, vvhich may induce him to beleefe, or may be a vvarning to others. For nether is the theef by hanging compelled to be true and honeſt, but only by that puniſhement is deterred from ſtealth, or at leaſt, is taken avvay from doing more hurt, and by his death is an exãple for others to take heed by. Yet I graũt that euen knovvn heretikes, are not by and by to be puniſhed, but al meanes poſſible to recal them by Svveetnes, are firſt to be vſed.

4. Novv vvheras *Sotcliff* tragically complaineth of Papiſts cruelties, I muſt tel him, that in al the *Canon lavv*, he ſhall not find any one Eccleſiaſtical lavv, vvhich puniſheth heretikes to death, but al ſuch lavves are ciuil and Temporal, decreed by the Emperours: by vvhich they vvere firſt puniſhed vvith pecuniarie mulctes and baniſhment, at length, this puniſhemẽt not hindring them from ſovving their hereſies, they vvere depriued of corporal life, leaſt they ſhould liue to depriue others of ſpiritual life. And ſo in *Flaunders* as *Alphonſus of Caſtro* affirmeth, and in other partes of lovver *Germanie*, they are beheaded, in other places they are caſt into the riuer, in *Italie*, *Spain*, and *Fraunce*, and

l. Conſti. l. Ariani. l. Manicheos. C. de hæret.

l. 2. de iuſt. hæret. puniend.

in tymes past in *England* (as al our *Chronicles* haue recorded) they were burned by fier, which is the element of obstinat deuils and heretikes, prefigured in those stubborn Schismatikes and murmurers of the old lavv, aboue mentioned. Only the Church declareth them to be heretiques, and deliuereth them to the seculare povver to punish them according to their lavves, vvheras yet the Church her selfe might punish, them as the aforesayd argumēts do cōuince. By this it apeareth that the *Tribunals* of *Inquisitors* (vvhich *Sotcliff* called bloudie) are iuste, bicause to inquire, and to examin *Heretikes* and *Apostates*, is the ordinarie office of the Bishop, vvho being the pastour of his diocese, is to chase these vvolues from his flocke. and therfore *Origen* makes mention of *Inquisitors* vvhō he calleth ἐπισκόπους. But bicause Bishops haue other charges, Inquisitors vvere giuen them as Coadiutors. So S. *Dominik* about the yeare 128. assisted his Bishop against the *Albigenses*, and after, *S. Peter* the *Martyr*, and others haue had the same office. In *Spain* since *Ferdinand* King of *Castile* and *Arragon*, this office is cōmitted to secular Preists ouer vvhom is a *General Inquisitor*, vvhom the *King* nominateth, the *Pope* confirmeth, and inducth vvith authoritie. And so vntil *Sotcliff* can proue his Ministers lavvful pastors, and his complices to be no heretikes, he can not iustly complain: and vntill he can proue our Prælates vnlavvfull, and vs to be heretikes (vvho yet are successors to the ancient Clergie and Christians that euer punished heretikes, and neuer vvere counted hereti-

l. 3. contra Celsum.

ques, nether can, as my second booke conuinceth) vve may and must complain of their cruel courses taken for the persequuting and punishing of vs.

## Sotcliffes seuenth marke.

*TO defend their peruerse and erroneous doctrin heretikes are vvont to detruncat, and by false expositions to peruert holy Scripturs, &c.*

### KELLISON.

1. HEre *Sotcliff* marketh him selfe for an heretique, for as vve haue seen in the second chapter of my first booke, and in the refutation of his fift marke, hee and his fellovves reiect al canonical bookes that stand in their vvay, as the bookes of *Iob*, *Tobie*, *Iudith*, *Hester*, *Ecclesiasticus*, the bookes of the *Machabees*, the Epistle to the *Hebreves*, *S. Iames*, and *S. Iudas* epistle, &c. and so are like *Marcion*, vvho for gnavving scripturs on this fashion, vvas called *Mus Ponticus*, the mouse of Pontus, and *Sotc:* can name no Canonical booke by vs reiected. And as I haue told him in my answer to his third marke, he hath no meanes to knovv vvhich bookes are canonical, and so absurdly makes it a marke of an heretique, to deny and detruncate scriptures, bicause markes should be manifest, and yet if he haue no meanes to knovv scripture hovv can he tell vvhen any detruncateth Scriptur? Likevvise to peruert the

l. præfer.

meaning of Scriptur, though it be sufficient to make an heretike, yet it is not a sufficient marke to know an heretike. Because as he saith, that *Lutheranes* peruert Scriptures, so vvil they say of *Caluinists*, and vvho shal be Iudge? and as *Sotcliff* saith that *Papists force Scriptures contrarie to the meaning of the holy Ghost*, so vvil they also say of him, and proue it also out of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, vvho (as vvee haue seen in our answer to *Sotcliffes* sixt marke) countes al expositions heretical, vvhich are cõtarie to the vniuersal Church, common consent, and ancient Fathers: and seing that *Sotcliffes* expositiõs of those vvordes *this is my body*, are contrarie to the Catholike Church, and to common consent, and antiquitie also, as appeareth by rayling against fathers vvhervvith aboue I haue charged him and his fellovves, he and his must needs be heretikes.

pag. 33. li. 4.

Li. cont. Proph. her. Nonit. ca. 37. 38.

Mat. 26.

pag. 35. li. 5.

Vvheras, to proue that Papists peruert Scriptur, he saith, that *they vvill needs haue the old Latin translation for authentical, vvhich yet cutteth of and addeth to the Original text:* I answer that the old *vulgat translation*, nether addeth nor detracteth from the Original Text, vvher it is pure and free from corruption, and I add that although the Hebraïcal Text, be not altogether corrupted, and may therfore be vsed very profitably, vvhen the vulgate Latin Text is obscure, or faultie by the fault of the Printer, yet is it not so pure as the Latin, nor so proper for the Church, in vvhich, fevv vnderstand Hebrevv. Vvherfore the Latin Translation is much commended by *S Austin*, *S Gregorie*, *Isidorus*, and *Rabanus*, and most vsed by them al; aboue thirteen

Aug. li. 2. doct chri. c. 15. li. 18. ciuit. c. 43.

hundred yeares agone: and consequently vvorthilie preferred by the *Councel* of *Trent*, yea and by *Beza* him selfe, before al other Textes. And vvhatsoeuer of importaunce may be obiected against this Translation, *Cardinal Bellarmin*, and the *Preface* to the *Rhems Testament*, haue answvered, to vvhom for Breuities sake, I remit the Reader. As for *Sotcliffes* cauil, vvhich here he repeateth against *Bellarmines* applicatiõ of those vvordes of *Esay*, *behold I will put thee a stone in the fondations of Sion*, vnto the Pope, I haue already answvered it. Sess. 4. Beza pref. in nouum Test. An. 1556. & annota. in 1. cap. Luc. Bel. to. 1. l. 2. de verbo Dei c. 11. 12. 13. 14

2. He addeth that *Papists do confesse those vvords, bibite ex hoc omnes, drinke ye al of this, as if none but the Preest vvere to drinke of the chalice.* And I answver that the construction is good. Because Christ spake thẽ to the Apostles only, vvhom at the same tyme he consecrated Priests to offer this holy and vnbloudie Sacrifice, and therfore S. Marke explicating vvho those all vvere, to vvhõ Christe dranke that Soueraign health or santé, and vvhom he inuited to pledge him, saith, *and they al drank of it*, to vvit al the Apostles, for none else did then drink vvith him. Novv if *Sotcliffe* haue the vvit to demaund, vvhy Christ should say rather *drink ye al of this*, then *eate ye also of this*, vnles it vvere to preuent the Papists, vvho deny the challice to the laytie? I answver that the canon of the Masse affirmeth that he sayd also *eate ye al of this*, and S. Ambrose & Paschasius do affirm the same. But vvere it that he sayd so only of the chalice, the reason might be, bicause he gaue the bread deuided, and so could not say *eate ye al of this*, bicause he gaue Isa 28. Mat. 26. 2. Marc. 14. Amb. l. 4. de Sacr. c. 5. Pasch. l. de corp. & sang. c. 15.

euerie one a distinct peece, but he gaue them al to drink of the same chalice, and so might fitly say, *drinke yee al of this*. If *Sotcl.* haue yet more wit to ob-
Io. 6. iect, that Christ at his promise made of this Sacrament, threatned, that *vnlesse wee eate his flesh & drinke his bloud wee shal haue no life in vs*: and that consequently the Romain Church hath peruerted this and the former place of Scriptur, in bidding only the Priests to drink of the chalice, and forbidding the People to so much as sipp of it: I answer first that the coniunction *et*, and, is taken there disiunctiuely, as if Christ had sayd *vnlesse you eate my flesh or drink my bloud, you shal haue no life in you*: and so it is sufficient for the laytie to communicate vnder one kind, bicause a disiunctiue commaundment, is fulfilled if one part be performed.
Io. 6. Wherfore Christe in the same place, as the Coun-
Sess. 21. c. 1. cel of Trent noteth, attributeth the same effect to the formes of bread a part, which he doth to both kindes, to wit *life euerlasting*. If *Sotcl.* say that this is a forced exposition. I can quote him diuers other places, where *et*, and, is taken disiunctiuely; as where in *Exodus* it is sayd, *hee that Killeth*
Exod 15. *his Father, and mother, let him dye the death*: for the sense is, he that Killeth, his father or mother shal
cap. 3. dye: bicause the one was sufficient: As also in the Actes, S. Peter being demaunded almes, answered that hee *had not siluer and gold*, that is not siluer nor gold, else he had not answered sufficiently, siluer only sufficing to almes giuing.
Commu- 3. Secondly I answer that Christ commaunded
nio vnder only to receue his body and bloud, and that the

lay, receue both vnder one kinde: for although *by force of the vvords and signe*, as diuines say, Christs body only is found vnder the formes of bread, yet his blood, soule, & diuinitie, are also there, by consequence and concomitaunce, al these being inseparably, since his Resurrection, vnited in Christes person: & so vnder the formes of bread, the Lay receue Christs bloud vvith the body though not in forme of drink or drinking, but eating: for vvhich cause S. Cyprian calleth it eating of Christs bloud. Vvhēce followeth that the People in respect of the thing conteined in this Sacrament, receue as much as the Priest, and as much grace vnder one kinde, as he vnder both, bicause the same Christe, vvho is the vertue of this Sacrament, and the cause of al grace giuen by it, is as vvholly vnder one Kind as both. And yet is not the chalice superfluously receued of the Priest, bicause it appertaineth to the integritie of the Sacrifice, vvhich the Priest offreth to represent the Sacrifice of the crosse, and the separation of Christs body, and bloud, for mans redemptiō: and he for that cause is to receue that grace by both Kinds ioyntly, vvhich the people receueth by one only. The learned Deuine Suarez is of opiniō, that Christe gaue no cōmaundment to the people, ether to receue both kinds, or ether of them determinatly, but only commaunded them to receue Christs body and bloud (vvhich only can be gathered out of Scriptur) and left it to the Churches discretiō, to determinate vvhether vnder both or one, yea vvhether vnder this or that

One Kind proued.

Ser. de cœna Dominī & ep. 3. Palchas. l. de corp. c. 14. Th. 3. p. q. 80. a. 12. ad 3. Opusc. 58. c. 19. Gab. lect. 84. Caiet. q. 84. a. 12. Alan. li. 1. Euch. c. 39 Suarez. disp. 63. sec. 6.

Supra.

l. 8. const. c. 13. 14. l. de Eccles. Hier. c. 3. ep. ad Ph.

kind. Vvherfore in the Primatiue Church many especially in the Greeke Church, receiued both Kinds, as vve gather out of S. *Clement*, *Dionisius Areopagita*, *Ignatius*, *Iustinus Martyr*, *S. Ambrose*, *S. Ciprian*, *S. Cirel*, *S. Chrisostome*. But to shevv that this vvas not necessarie, the communion vnder the formes of bread vvas also practised. And to omit that it is probable that Christ communicated his tvvo disciples going to *Emaus*, vnder the formes of bread only, vvhich S. *Bede*, *Theophilact*, and S. *Austin* do affirm, and the benediction of Christ, and the opening of the disciples eyes in the breaking of that bread, doth insinuate: To let passe that *Caluin* him selfe, by breaking of bread in this place vnderstandeth his communion: the practise of the Church conuinceth no less.

For first the lay people vsed to cary the Sacred *Eucharist* home in their hands, as *Iustinus Martyr*, *Tertulian*, *S. Cyprian*, *S. Hierom*, *Eusebius*, and Baronius do report, vvhich argued that they communicated vnder the formes of bread only, for that only they caried in their hands. Secondly the *Eucharist* vvas reserued for the cōsolation and deuotion of the people, and for a ready *Viaticum* for the sick, vvhich needs must be the formes of bread, bicause the formes of vvine could not be long cōserued. This custom, the Councel of *Nice*, *S. Clement* and *S. Ambrose* do mention. And vve read, in S. Basils life that he reserued the *B. Eucharist* *in columba aurea*: and Amphilochius and *Paulinus* do relate hovv *S. Basil* and *S. Ambrose* at their death receued the body of Christ not mentioning his

Iud. Apol. 2. l. offic. c. 41. ep. 54. 63. Cat. 5. Myst. ho. 47. in 1. Cor. Act. 24. Bed. Theoph. ibid. Aug. li. 3. de cōsen. Euang. c. 25. Cal. in Act. 20.

Apol. 2. l. 2. ad vxo. ser. de lap.

Apol. cōt. Iouin l. 5. c. 36. Baro. tom. 1. an. chr. 57. an. Pet. 15. Conc. Nic. c. 12. 13. ca. Presby. de conf. d. 2. Amb. ora. pro Sat. Clem. ep. 1. ad Iac. Amphil. in vita Basil Paulin. in vit. Ambr.

bloud: vvhich argueth that thē they cōmunicated as the lay did, vnder the formes of bread only bicause the formes of vvine are cōmonly called the blood of Christe, as representing only that. Thirdly on *good Fryday* the custome hath been this lōg tyme for the Priest to cōmunicate vnder the formes of bread only, as vve read in *S. Gregorie* and *Alcuinus*. And although (as I haue sayd) many, at the first, receued both kinds, bicause that seemed most sure, and the Church had not yet determined, that both kinds vvere not necessarie: yet the Church perceiuing that as both kinds in Scriptur are not forbidden, so nether are they commaunded, and knovving that in one kinde there is as much as in both, and perceiuing that one kind vvas often tymes vsed by the primatiue Church, and experiencing vvhat danger ther vvas in communicating the people (vvhose number novv vvas augmented) vnder the formes of vvine, yea hovv hard also it vvas to consecrate at one tyme so much vvine as vvas requisit: vnderstanding also that some heretikes began to teach, that Christ vvas not entierly in eche of the external formes (vvhich seemed to be *Berengarius* opinion, and vvhich certain monkes, as *Cardinal Allen* relateth did expressely teach, till by miraculous issuing out of bloud out of y^e^ formes of bread they vvere taught the cōtrarie) for these causes I say, y^e^ Church graunted only one Kinde vnto the people, and since Berengarius heresie, as Thomas vvalden, auerreth, this hath been the general praūtise of the Church: and at length the Councel of

Grego. in Sacram ēt. Alc. li. de offic Eccl. c. de Paraſceue.

l. 11. de Euch. c. 41.

Th' vvald. to. 2. de Sacra. c. 84. Concil.

Const. sess. 13 Conc. Trid. sess. 21. c. 1.

*Constance*, and lastly the Councel of *Trent*, haue forbidden the people to communicate vnder both Kindes, and haue defined that to be sufficient. By this *Sotcliffe* may see, if he haue eyes, that the Romain Church misconstrueth not those vvords of Scripture, *Drinke yee all of this*, and he vnderstandeth, hovv the lay people fulfil Christs commaundement of receiuing his body and bloud, and are not in any vvise defrauded, hauing as much vnder one Kinde as the Priest vnder both.

## *Sotcliffes eight marke.*

*HEretikes conceal diuers of their false and levvd doctrines &c.*

KELLISON.

1. NOt al heretikes, Sir Dean, do conceal their doctrine. *Ireneus*, and *Tertulian*, alleaged by you, speak only of the Gnosticks vvho bicause they taught Phantastical, and both taught and practised obscene thinges, they did al in Hugger mugger. As for example. they taught that *Nun*, vvas born of the vnborn Father, that from *Nun*, νους proceeded, from *Logos*, *Phronesis*, hō *Phronesis*, *Sophia* and *Dynamis*, from *Dynamis* and *Sophia*, the Angels, vvhom they called the Architects and creatours of the Heauens, vvhich they sayd vvere in number 365. They added that the last Angel, the gouernour of the last heauen, vvas the God of the Ievves, and he turbulent and cruel, vvho endeuoured to haue subdevved al

Iren. l. 1. c. 23. Ign. ep. ad Trall. Tertul. li. præsc. c. 46 Epiph. hæ. 24. 26. 27.

nations, and to haue brought them in ſubiection to the Iewes. but the vnborn father, ſent his ſonne *Nun* to reſtiſt him, vvhich *Nun*, they ſayd, ſeemed to be crucified but vvas not, only *Symon Cyrenæus* vvas put to death for him: and therfore they forbad to beleeue in him that vvas crucified. They vſed Images for Incãtation, had their vviues common, and (vvhich chaſt eares abhorre to heare) they offered their pollutions for their Euchariſt, vvhich they compounded of that matter, and did eate the ſame: vvhen any vvoman vvas brought to bed they ſtamped the Child in a Mortar, and ſpicing it, did eate it: they forbad faſting, and ſayd that al ſhould make good Cheare, to *reddere debitum* to one another. And notvvithſtanding this abominable & groſſe doctrin, they called them ſelues *Gnoſticks*, that is vviſe and learned, affirming that they only knevv the truth. And ſo vnder the name of Chriſtian, they infamed the true Chriſtians, as *Tertulian* and others haue obſerued. Theſe heretikes to hide theſe ãbominations, like to *Pithagoras*, commaunded ſilence to their diſciples, and did al in obſcuritie. So the *Valentinians* did, of vvhom *Tertulian* ſaith *nihil magis curant quam occultare quod prædicant, ſi tamen prædicant quod occultant: they endeuour nothing more then to hide vvhat they preach, if they may be ſayd to preach vvhat they hide.* and again, *Ne diſcipulis quidem proprijs ante committunt quam ſuos fecerint. habent artificium, quo prius perſuadeant quam doceant.* But, as I ſayd, al heretikes do not hide their doctrine, and ſo this is no general mark,

Apol. c. 7. Epiph he. 27. Euſeb. l. 4. c. 7.

lib cont. Valent. in initio.

nether do only heretikes hide their doctrin, and so it is no mark at al: for true Christians do hide their doctrin also, though not for that cause, for which heretikes conceale theirs. In the old lavv the name of God called *Iehouah*, vvas once a yeare only pronounced, and by the high priest only, and in *Sancto Sanctorum* only: other tymes it vvas hidden in the secret closet of silence. The beginning of *Genesis*, and the beginning and end of *Ezechiel*, as *S. Hierom* vvitnesseth, vvere read by no man before he vvas 30. yeares of age: and the substaunce of that lavv vvas but shadovves and figures of the mysteries of the nevv. *Baptism* vvas vealed in the redd Sea, the *Eucharist* in the *Paschal* lamb, yea in *Manna* also, and *Melchisedechs* bread and vvine: Christe crucified, in the *brazen serpent*, his burial and Resurrection in *Ionas*, the Church of Christe in the land of promise, yea in the Synagogue it selfe. The Trinitie not knovvn to any but the Prophets and the high priests. And although after that the veale of the Temple vvas rent, many mysteries vvere reuealed, yet so obscurelie, that S. Paule calleth the *Incarnation, mysterium absconditum a seculis*, for vvhich cause the Grecians cal our cheefest points of faith *mysteries*, that is hidden. For the Greek vvord μυστηριον is ether deriued ἀπὸ τῦ μυεῖν τὸ στομα vvhich signifieth to shut the mouth, or of μυω and ὑρω vvhich signifieth to hide and keep secret, and puttes vs in mynd that our mysteries, as Dionisius and Origen do Councel, are not to be diuulged, but to be kept vnder silence, according as the Ethnike

in proem. Ezech.

Cæl. li. 9. Ant. lect. c. 9.

Dion. li. Eccl. Hier. c. 1.

Orig. ho. 5. in Num.

Priests

Priests did, vvho after answer had from the Oracle, put their finger on their mouth, to signifie that the Oracles answers vvere to be hid in silence: and the Ægiptians placed *sponges* before their Temples to giue to vnderstand, that mysteries vvere not to be diuulged: And did not Christ declare many things to his Apostles vvhich he concealed frō others, or else vttered them in darke parables? did hee not tell the Apostles that hee had many things to tell them vvhich they could not yet carie away? & did hee not forbid to *cast holye before doggs, and margarites before Swine*, that is, Sacramentes and mysteries before Iewes and Gentils, vvhich vvere nether vvorthy as yet, nor capable? did not S. Paul *feed the Corinthians vvith milke*, imparting to them only the easier points of faith, & hiding frō them the harder mysteries as meat not fit for their vveakish stomackes, and *preaching vvisdome only amongst the perfect*? did not al the Apostles forbid to vvrite the Creed, that no man might learn it but by vvord of mouth of the Christians, and that so it might serue for a vvatch vvord to distinguish Christians from infidels, and true from fayned beleeuers? So that if to conceal doctrine, taken so generally as *Sotcliff* doth, be a mark of an heretike, God in the old lavve, Christ his sonne in the nevv, the Apostles also and their Schollers, vvere al heretikes.

Plut. l. de Isid.

Luc. 8.

Mat. 13.

Io. 16.

Hieron. et Opus. Imp. in hunc locum.

1. Cor. 3.

Hieron. ep. 81. ad Pamach.

2. Novv if vve consider the reasons vvhich *Sotcliff* hath brought to proue that Catholikes do conceal their doctrine, vve shal see that he concealeth not his follie. his first reason is, bicause

Papiſts pronounce their Canon in ſecret. A dowvtie reaſon I vvarrant you. for beſides that the Canon cõſiſteth of prayer and ceremonies, and teacheth no doctrin, if the Church did pronounce it ſecretly to conceal doctrin, vvhy doth ſhe print it, and before printing, vvhy did ſhe vvrite it and diuulge it to al the vvorld? vvhy haue ſo many explicated euerie ceremonie yea euerie part and parcel ther of, as *Alcuinus* hath done a1000. yeares agone, and after him *Innocentius* the third, *Saint Thomas* of *Aquin*, *Gabriel Biel*, and in this our age, *Cardinal Bellarmin*, *Suarez* and *Azorius*? yea theſe autours haue proued euery part of the Canon to be conformable to faith, and in no point repugnaunt to reaſon. The reaſon then of pronouncing the Canõ in alovv voice, can not be to conceal doctrine, but for other cauſes. firſt, bicauſe in the Maſſe, ſome things appertain only to the Prieſt, as the oblation and conſecration: and ſo the vvords of the *Offertorie* and *conſecration*, and other prayers thervnto belonging, the Prieſt pronounceth to him ſelfe: ſome things appertain only to the people, as, *Dominus vobiſcum* and *Pax vobis*, and therfore theſe are pronounced in an audible voice: other things belong to the Prieſt & people indifferently, as the *Epiſtle*, the *Collect*, *Gloria in excelſis*, the *Creed*, the *Preface*, the *Pater noſter*, and theſe are ſpoken vvith a lovvd voice. The ſecond reaſon is to entertein in the people a more reuerent conceit. And therfore before the *Canon*, the Prieſt cryeth out to them, *Surſum corda*, and in as high tone ſingeth or ſayeth the *Preface* to ſtirr vp

Sotc firſt reaſon.

Alc l. de offic. &c. In. lib. de myſt. Tho. 3 p. q. 83 a 4. 5. Stapl. 2 ibid. Gab. in cã. Bel. to. 2. Azor in Inſt. mor.

reaſons of pronouncing the canon na lovv voice.

1. reaſon.

2. reaſon.

the peoples deuotion: and then vvith a silent voice, reciteth the *Canon*, that the people may knovv that some great mysteries are at hand, and noe lesse then the dread Sacrifice. vvherfore S. Ambrose *lib. de iis qui initiantur c. 9. l. 6 de Sacram. c. 4.* saith the canon is pronounced secretly, bicause *in ineffable mysteries nothing is more agreeable then silence*, 3. reason. Thirdly by this secret prayer, the Priest inuiteth the people to contẽplation and mental prayer, in vvch the mynd is most collected. Fourthly he thus putteth before their eyes, the humain feare of the disciples, vvho at the Passion of Christ, vvere so astonished and scarred, that they fled & hid themselues and durst not profess their faith but secretly. Fifthly this ceremonie representeth the silence of our B. Sauiour before *Herod* and *Pilat*, and his retired and solitarie life, vvhich he led vvhen he vvithdrevv him selfe from the publik vevve, a little before his passion, vvhich is commemorated by the Sacrifice of the Masse. 4. reason. Tho. 3. p. q. 83. a. 4. ad 6. 5. reason.

3. This ceremonie of reading the *Canon* in a lovv voice, is venerable for antiquitie being mẽtioned in al the *Liturgies*, and approued by Saint Ciril and S. Basil also, vvho for this cause calleth the *Canon Secretum*: and as the *Counsel* of *Trent* hath obserued, it is conformable to Christs Example, vvho sometymes in silence, and Secrecie al alone, sometymes vvith a lovvd voice prayed, as in the mountain, in the garden, and on the crosse. and the vvholle *Masse*, and prayers, and ceremonies ther in contained, as they are explicated and defended by the aforesayd Autours, so are they most Ciril. Catech. 5. & 6. Basil. l. de Spir. sancto c. 27 Trid. ss. 22. c. 5. can. 9. The antiquitie and cõuenience of this ceremonie.

consumable to the Sacrifice which in the Masse is offered. For this *Sacrifice* is a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and therfore prayses of God and thanksgiving wch are vsed in many places of the Masse, can not be vnseeming: It is an Impetratorie Sacrifice, and so prayers and petitions in the Masse are fitly vsed: It is *Mysterium fidei*, a mysterie of faith, & so the *Epistle*, *Ghospel*, and *Creed*, not without cause are read therin. It is a representation and commoratio of Christs Passion: & so the crosses, wch the priest maketh with his handes, the Aultar before him, the crosse vppon the Aultar, the vestements which he weareth, the gestures which he vseth, are not vnfidly vsed, being as it were so many lanages or voices, to represent, and proclaim vnto vs the passion of Christe.

Vide Suarez 3. p. q. 83. a. disp. 83. sect. 1.

*Sect.* obiect that this ceremonie of pronouncing the Canō in a low voice, with many other late added vnto Christs institutiō, I deny that therfore they are to be reprehended. For although the substaunce of the Masse, which is the Sacrifice, was vsed only to be instituted by Christ, and in this respect is commaunded by him in scripture, yet the addition of prayers and ceremonies was left to the Church, for greater decencie and edification, and accordingly they were added by the Apostles and their schollers and successors. And it is probable that the Apostles added those wordes in the Masse *Quæ pridie quam paterentur* &c, because they are word for word in the Masse composed by S. James. *Hieron* also, and *S. Gregorie* affirm that the Apostles added the *Pater noster*. Tho.

Mat. 26. Mark. 14. Luc. 22. 1. Cor. 11. Ibidem tel. 28.

Hier. in Epitaph. Greg. l. 7. ep. 64.

disciples and the Popes their successors, added other prayers and ceremonies, as in this Sacrifice, so in yᵉ administration of Baptism and other Sacraments. vvherfore S. Austin saith: *non præcepit dominus quo ordine dominum hoc Sacramentũ sumeretur, vt Apostolo per quos Ecclesias disposturus erat seruaret hunc locum*, our lord commaunded not in vvhat order the Sacrament should be receiued, that he might keep this place for the Apostles, by vvhom he vvas to dispose the Church. But if Sotcliff vvil stand to it, that nothing is to bee ordayned for the ofting of the Sacrifice and administration of Sacraments, but vvhat Christ in Scriptur hath expressed, vvhy do the Superintendẽts in England by their nevv Canõs commaunde the vse of the signe of the crosse in Baptism? vvhy haue their Church authorised an Inglish masse vvithout cõsecration, vvhich is but an apish imitation of the ancient and true Masse? 4. Sotcliffes second reason to proue that Catholikes conceal their doctrin is, *because they forbid the lay to dispute*. Here Sotc: proueth him selfe so simple a Disputer, that I thinke if his Superintendents should aggree vppon any publike disputation, he should be none of the disputers. For if *to forbid the lay to dispute*, be to conceale doctrin, and to vveare the badge of an heretike; his Superintendents must permit Coblers, Quailcatchers, Vvaterbearers, Mustardmakers, and vvhatsoeuer base artificers, to dispute of matters of Religion, else Sotcliff pronounceth them heretikes *for concealing doctrin*. But I smel vvhat he harpeth at. In his and his Ministers opinion, the spirit (as vve haue seen)

ep. 118.

Canõ. 10.

Sotcliffes 4. reason.

is the Iudge and Doctour vvho Iudgeth, determineth, and cleareth al concerning Scriptur, and the meaning of Scriptur, and seing that this Spirit (as they say) is common to al true faithfull, noe man is to learn his faith of others, but only of the inward spirit vvhich telles him assuredly vvhich is scriptur and the meaning of Scriptur. And for as much as al disputatiō almost, about faith, is moued cōcerning Scriptur, and the true meaning of scripture, if the priuat spirit assure vas vvhich is Scriptur and vvhat is the meaning, the Minstrel may as vvel dispute as *Sanders* the Minister, bicause he hath the spirit as vvel as he. But the Catholike Church vvhich maketh the Pastors of the Church and General councels Iudges in matters of Religion, forbiddeth the lay to dispute in any set disputation, ether priuatly or publikly, and that vnder paine of Excommunication: and vvith good reason also: bicause it appertaineth not to their coate, for, *numquid omnes Doctores?* and they commonly are vnlearned and ignoraunt, especially in diuinitie, and so by il pleading might marre a good cause, and expose our faith to derision. Vvherfore vvhē one *Demosthenes*, prefect of the Emrour *Valens* his Kitchin, vvould needs be disputing of matters of religion, S. Basil gaue him this quipp: *Tuum est curare insulsorum condimenta, neque enim cum ita fordidatis auribus, excudere tractationes dogmatum diuinorum.* It is thy office to looke to the Porrige-pot, for thou canst not vvith such fovvle eares vnderstand the discourses of diuine doctrines. Yet vvil I not deny but that vvhen an here-

aboue. booke. 2. chap. 5.

Cap. Qui cunque. § Inhibemus. de hæret. in 6. et cap. cùm ex iniuncto. cap. sicut in vno. de hæret. Disputation of faith not permitted to al

ex Theodor. l. 9. hist. c. 19.

tike or infidel ſetteth vppon a lay man, he may defend his faith and impugn hereſie or infidelitie, if he haue the learning: yea in the abſence of a ſufficient Clergie man, he may priuatly ſet vppon an heretike if he haue hope to do good and no harme: but as for ſet diſputation in the preſence of others, be it publike or priuat, it is forbidden to a lay man, though neuer ſo learned, vnleſſe the Superiour vvarrant him, or great neceſſitie vvhich hath no lavv, giue him the leaue. Yea publike and ſet diſputation is forbidden alſo to clergimen vnleſſe neceſſitie conſtrain them or the Pope giue them licence: not becauſe, our Church feareth to let her doctrin to bee knovvn, (bicauſe ſhe preacheth this doctrine to al, ſhe permitteth diſputatiō of it in Schooles for the better clearing of difficulties, and ſhe hath permitted many diſputations vvith heretikes and infidels in the Councel of Nice and diuers other Councels) but bicauſe ther may be dāger, if inſufficient men ſhould diſpute of faith: and it vvere to derogate to God and his religion, to permit euerie one to babble of diuine matters, as miniſters and merchantes vviues novv a dayes do, in their priuat hovvſes and tauernes, of holy Scriptur. For as *S. Gregorie Nazianzen* ſaith, euerie one may thinke of God, but it is not for euerie one to diſpute of God, of vvhom euen to ſpeake the truth (as another ſayth) is not vvithout danger. Let ſinne therfore fly the light, bicauſe it is the vvork of Darknes, and let errour and hereſie ſhame to come abread, bicauſe it is abſurd & hideous. As for

*Orat. 1. de Theol.*

the Catholike Religion, it is the truth, which, as Tertulian saith, *nihil erubescit nisi solummodo absconditum*, feareth nor shameth nothing but only to bee hidden.

Leont. valent. c. 2.

5. And as concerning Sotcliffes Church and Religion, though it be a moonster of many heades & disaggreeing parts, and therfore so vgly, that at the first appearaunce, the vvorld stood amazed at it, yet Catholikes neuer feared by disputatiō and vvriting to encounter vvhith this *Hidra*, or *Hippocentaur*. Ther vvanted not an *Eckius*, vvho in the disputatiō at *Lypsia* in the præsence of *George* duke of Saxonie, encountred vvith those tvvoe Goliases, *Luther* and *Carolstadius*, and like another Dauid foyled them both, and vvrested frō them by force of argument, the veritie of *Freevvil*, the Popes *Supremacie*, *Purgatorie*, *Indulgences*, *penaunce* and *absolution*: and ther it vvas that *Luther* sayd, *se non impugnare nec Christiane a quoquam impugnari posse, primatum Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, that he impugned not the primacie of the Church of Rome, vvhich by no man could Christianly be impugned: there he made this confession: *ego quidem fortiter, imo audacter dicere ausim scio purgatorium esse &c.* I vvho beleeue strongly, yea dare be bold to say, I know vvel that purgatorie is, ame easilie persuaded that in Scripture ther is mention made of it, as Gregorie in his Dialogues bringeth in that of S. Mathevv, it is not remitted neither in this vvorld nor in the next, giuing to vnderstand that some sinnes are remitted in purgatorie. I admitt also, sayd *Luther* there, that of the Second of the Machabees, It is an holy and holsom cogitation to pray for the dead. There also in a tage, he confessed, that this his entrepriſe of tea-

Catholiques haue offered disputation.

Cocleus in actis Luth. an. 1531.

c 11.

ching nevv doctrine, *vvas neither begun for gods cause nor vvas to be ended for gods cause.* Nether vvanted ther learned diuines to dispute vvith the learnedst of the nevv religion in king Edvvards *Queen Maries*, and *Queen Elizabethes* raign, and *Campian* and others haue offred disputatiõ, and could not be accepted. In Fraunce at *Poisi* in the yeare 1560. that famous Prelat *Charles Cardinal* of Lorrain vvith *Spenseus* and others, cõferred vvith *Beza*, *Peter Martyr* and others, and put them to shame in vrging them to shevv their missiõ. And in the yeare 1572. *Maldonat*, the learned Iesuit, by disputation, and Declamation foiled and confounded *Capel*, *Helin*, *Coquieu*, and tvventie other ministers at *Sedan*. And in the yeare also 1600. the Bishop of *Euroux* novv Cardinal, entred into combat vvith *Plessis Mornay*, concerning his false allegations, and in the præsence of the King, got the victorie of him to his æternal cõfusiõ, as in the like cõbat, Doctour Harding had got of *Ievvel*, to his no lesse shame and disgrace. So that vve forbid not disputations to conceal our doctrin, but for the causes alleaged, vvho, othervvise haue graunted and offred many disputations, and by our so many bookes, do shevv that vvee are not ashamed of our doctrine.

ex Gen. l. 4. Chron. an. 1572.

6. His third reason to proue that vvee conceale our doctrine is, for that vvee forbid *Holy Scripture to be read either publikely or of al Christians in vulgar tongues vvithout restraint.* Here again is our *Sotel*: deceued, for nether doth the Church this, thereby to conceal her doctrine, but for other causes

Sotel. 3. reason.

reasons against vulgare translations.

vvhich I shal alleage. first bicause Christ sanctified three tongues vvith the title of the crosse, to vvit, *Hebrevv*, *Greek* and *Latin*, therfore the Church vvould haue gods vvord not to bee vvritten commonly in any other tongue, then one of those three sanctified tongues. The second reason is bicause these three tongues are the most perfect, most common, and most ancient: vvher as the Inglish, Scottish, Flemish, Germain and french tongues, in vvhich the Lutheranes, and Caluinistes, propose their bible, besides many barbarismes vvhich they contein, are nether so pure as being mixt vvith vvordes of other languages, nor so significant, nor so common, nor so ancient. vvherfore before the Romain Empire vvas dilated, the Greeke tongue vvas most common, but after the encrease of this Empire, the Latin vvas most in request: vvheras the *Inglish*, *Scottish*, and other vulgare tongues are scarse vnderstood of any, beside the inhabitaunts of the countries. And therfore *S. Austin* and *Euthimius* affirm that *Pilat* caused Christes Title, *Iesus Nazarenus King of the Iewes* to be vvritten in Hebrevv Greek, and Latin, bicause those three tongues vvere most common and so most easilie to bee vnderstood of so many diuers nations as then vvere come to Hierusalem. Thirdly it is not conuenient that the holy scriptur should vvithout al discretion, be made common to al, for so the *holy* migh: be giuen to dogges, that is snarling heretikes, and margarits should be cast before svine, that is filthy infidels, and therfore the vvord

Ioh. 19. Hil. præf. in psal.

Bar. tom. 1. an. 251. 6.

Aug. tract. 117 in Ioh. Euth. in Matth. c. 27

not to be diuulged in vulgare tõgues. Fourthly if the publike and cõmon vse of scripturs & diuine seruice vvere in vulgare tongues, vve must haue as many diuers translations of thé both, as tongues, vvhich vvould hinder cõmunicatiõ of Christiãs: vvho vvhen they goforth of their ovvn countrie, should be altogether ignorant both of scripturs and diuine seruice, of other countries: as if an Inglish man should go to diuine seruice in vvales, and there finde both scriptur & seruice in vvelsh. And contrarie vvise vvhen scriptur and diuine seruice is in Latin, vvee finde al the same vvher soeuer vve come: as in S. Bedes time though ther vvere fiue diuers tõgues in our countrie, yet scriptur in Latin, vvas cõmon to them al. Fiftly to diuulge scripturs in vulgar tõgues, vvere to prophane them and to turn this good to our euil: bicause base artificers vvould haue the text of scriptur by hart, as perfectly as the Priest: and so in tauerns amongest the portes, scripturs vvould be table-talke: in merriments, that iest vvould go for the best, in vvhich scriptur is turned to a iest: yea vvomen, as their sex is talkatiue, vvould talke & reason of scripturs euen spinning by the candle: & so scriptur vvould not only, by to much familiaritie, be brought in contempt, but vvould also, though of it self most good, turn to the peoples hurt. For many of the simple sort, vvould stagger at hard places of scriptur, of vvhich some ther are vvhich seeme to be cõtrarie to others, as vve haue seen in the first booke and second chapter. So the *Anthropomorphites*, the first vvherof vvere

lib. 1. hist. gent. Aug. c. 1.

Edit. 2. pag. 51.

some simple religious men, reading in Scriptur
ex Cass collat. 10. ca. 1. 3. 4. 5 of gods eyes, eares, armes, and feet, imagined God to be of a corpulent substaunce: so some *vnskible and vnlerned persons*, misvnderstood S. Paules Epistles: so, many vveauers, taylors, and other artificers, yea sillie vvomen, in the raign of King Henrie the 8. and of Queen Marie, held
2. Pet. 3. many absurd heresies, alleaging Scriptur vvhich they had in their vulgair tongue, for euerie thing: and hence proceeded the phantasies of *Hammond Lewis*, and *Hacquet*, and others mentioned in our
See stovv pag. 1183. late Chronicles: and vvhat is it that hath made 1183. 1189. our puritanes so madde & phantastical, but their reading of Scriptur in Inglish and expounding it by their spirit; vvhat made *David George* that knevv noe other language then Hollandish, to deny Christ to be the true Messias, but bicause he
David George, read in his Hollandish bible, that the true Church should neuer fall, and yet vvas told by *Luther* & others, that papistrie for many hundred yeares had preuailed against Christs Church, vvhence he inferred, that Christ vvas not the true *Messias* nor his Church the true Church. Some also vvhé they should read the historie of *Susanna*, of *Dauids* homicide and aduoutrie, of the *Patriarches* Combines (vvhich yet vvere their true vviues) of their apparantlyes, and such like, they vvould be scandalized, and vvould excuse their ovvn vices by such examples. *Bellarmin* reporteth hovv vvhen a minister in England, read the 25. chapter of *Ecclesiasticus* vvhich speaketh against vvoemen, one
to 1. l. 2. cap. 15. vvoman rose vp and sayd, is this the vvord of

God? nay rather the vvord of the deuil. For although Scriptur of it selfe be most holy, and *res immaculata*, yet good may by abuse, be turned to euil. fire is good but dangerous to the child that sittes by it: a svvord is good but not in a madd mans hand: vvine is good, but if it be moderatly taken: and meate is good, yet by euil diet is made the cause of al diseases: and so although Scriptur be the vvord of God, and the food of the soule, and a light to our steppes, and the svvord of the spirit, yet by abuse, as (*S. Austin trac. 17. in Ioa. saith, non aliunde nata sunt hereses, quam dum scripturæ bonæ, intelliguntur non bene.*)

7. And I vvould demaund of our Aduersaries, a demand. vvhy they vvould haue Scriptur in Inglish and other vulgair tongues? no doubt, that so the people might learn their faith and dutie. But besides the inconueniences alleaged, nether so can they, by them selues, learn al things expedient or necessarie: bicause many places of Scriptur (as vve haue seen) are hard euen to those that are furnished vvith al tongues and literature, as appeareth by many learned heretikes, vvho haue by mystaking Scripturs meaning, forged many heresies: and vvithout the aforesayd inconueniences, though Scriptur be in Latin, by their Pastours sermons and Catechismes, they may be taught their dutie better, and vvith lesse danger, then if by the vse of vulgair tongues, they should be permitted to be their ovvn caruers. For the Pastour can mynce this solid meate, and can chevv it like a Nurse, to make it eatable of youngones, vvhose

stomakes can brooke only milke or soft meates: that is, he can reueal vnto them, vvhat is requisit for them to knovv, and can giue them vvith Scriptur, the right meaning of Scriptur, that so this *good*, may do them good, and in no vvise turn to their harm. Hence it is that the Apostles vvrote not the Ghospels and epistles in vulgair tongues, but only in Hebrevv, Greek, or Latin: yea S. Paule vvriting to the Romains, vvrote in Greek, and yet Latin vvas then their vulgar tongue, and S. Iames, and S. Peter vvriting to the Ievves dispersed, vvrote also in Greeke, and yet their vulgar tongue vvas the lāguage of the countrie vvherin they dvvelled. And for the first fovvre hundred yeares the Publike vse of Scriptur, in the vvest Church vvas neuer in the vulgair tongue, but as *S. Austin* affirmeth for *Africa*, *S. Isidore* for *Spayn*, *S. Bede* for *Ingland*, *Alcuinus* and *Amalarius* for *Fraunce*, *Rabanus* for *Germanie*, *S. Gregorie* the seuenth for *Bestmland*, *Isidore* and *S. Thomas* of *Aquin*, for *Italie*; it vvas in the Latin tongue. Yet I vvill not deny but that the Church hath permitted the vse of Scriptur in vulgair tongues priuatly, and to some persons, as *Malmesburie* affirmeth that of ancient tyme, vve haue had vulgair Translations in Inglād, of vvhich he maketh *S. Bede* the authour, and *Æneas Siluius* saith the *Moranians*, had leaue from Rome to haue their publike seruice also in their ovvn language. The french of long tyme haue had their frēch Bibles, at least from the tyme of *Charles* the French King, and fift of that name. And to the Inglish Catholikes, the *Pope* permit-

1. Cor. 3.

Aug. l. 2. Doct. Christ. ca. 13. Isid. l. 1. de diuin of. cap. 2. Bed l. 1. c. 1 l. 2 de Inst. Cler. l. 7. epist l. 1. de off Ecc. c. 11 vide Bel. l. 1. de verbo dei cap 15. hovv vulgare väs permitted l. hist. Bohem.

teth the newv Teſtament tranſlated by the Doctours and Profeſſors of the Ingliſh College in Remes. And the Councel of *Trent* in the Table, of prohibited bookes, and fourth rule, permitteth the vſe of the vulgair tranſlation to them, vvhom the Biſhop or Inquiſitor, vvith the aduiſe of the Paſtour, ſhal thinke to bee ſuch as vvil read them to their edification, and not to their hurt and dommage.

## Sotcliffes 9. marke.

*Clement of Alexandria* lib. 7. Strom. *telleth vs that heretikes being conuinced do often tymes deny their doctrin, So likevviſe Papiſts &c.*

### Kellison.

HEre vve ſee that many a one ſpeakes of Robin Hood that neuer ſhot in his bovve, for our Dean hath ſpoken much of heretikes, and of the markes to knovv them, and yet knovves not vvhat an heretike is. For he makes him an heretike that denyes his faith or doctrin, and yet *Diuines* and *Fathers*, do hold, that as faith and confeſſion of faith, are tvvoe things vvhich may be ſeparated, ſo hereſie and denial of faith are diſtinct. and ſo a faithfull man remaining faithfull and retaining inuvvard faith, and belecf, may deny his faith vvith mouth as S. Peter did. Vvherfore as hereſie is an errour of the vnderſtanding ioined vvith pertinacie, ſo an heretike is hee only that in hart and vnderſtanding, belecueth otherviſe then the Church teacheth: and conſequently to deny faith vvho is an heretike.

S. Tho. et Caiet. et Banes et Arogon. 2. 2. q. 11. a. 1. Canus. l. 12. de locis ca. 8. Simanc. tit. 17. n. 16. Aug. ep. 162.

vvith mouth, is no marke of an heretike. Yet I graunt that to affirm, that it is lavvful to deny our faith is an heresie, and if it be affirmed from the hart, sufficient to make an heretike: but al heretikes haue not holden that opinion. only some, as the Priscilianists embraced it, vvho also taught their Schollers this verse: *Iura, perjura, secretum prodere noli.* If *Sotc* answer that he meaneth only that heretikes being cõuinced, do deny their doctrin therby to cõceale it, neither so shal he escape my fingars: bicause al heretikes do not so, for some stãd stiffly in defence of their heresies, and so it is no general marke, & thus also this mark differeth not from the 8. marke of *concealing doctrin*, and so is not a distinct marke. And hovv so euer he taketh this marke, it grimeth him & his founders, *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Caluin* and the rest, vvho being conuinced and forced to graunt *free vvil*, and necessitie of good vvorkes, and that God is not autour of sinne, that his sonne is not *ouerlor*, that Princes lavves bynd in conscience, vvil not stand to the defence of these points, vvhich they haue taught, but seeke euasions. And *Sorcliff* him selfe seing hovv absurd it is to say, that the Church fell or became inuisible, denyeth both, as vve haue seen in the defence of the first chapter of my first book, though at first they al affirmed it and stil do, till they bee pressed; and notvvithstãding that *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Caluin*, and others deny al fathers, as *Sotc* also in effect doth as vve haue seen aboue in the defence of the fourth chapter; yet vvhen they are pressed, they say that they honour fathers and

et Aug. her 10. et hb. cont mend c. 6.

Supra fol 40. 41.

receue

receaue them. And hovv *Sotcliff* in this point is faultie, vvee shal see hereafter. Vvheras he saith, that Catholikes *do openly refuse to professe that the Pope hath power to commaund the subiects to cut their Kinges throats, and vvill not graunt that Images, are to be vvorshipped vvith diuine honour, yet to their followers in secret, doubt not to propound those points vvithout scrupule of conscience.* I meruail hovv he came to be so familiar vvit Papists as to knovv their secrets: and I must tel him that vve nether teach that subiects may cut their Princes throats, but are to obey, & honour them as aboue I haue proued fol. 13. 14. nor that Images are to be vvorshipped vvith diuine honour, that being devv only to God, as vvee shal see in the third booke: and vvhat vvee teach in secret concerning these points, vvee teach in our printed bookes.

## Sotcliffes 10. mark.

*HEretikes denying their faith to God seldom keep faith to men as the exaple of the Prisalianists doth plainly declare, &c.*

### KELLISON.

1. THis marke marketh our Ministet for an ill logician, bicause he proueth an vniuersal proposition by a particuler, to vvit, that al heretikes are vnfaithfull to men, bicause the *Prisalianists* vvere. Vvhich maner of arguing if it be permitted, then a man may inferr that al ministers are ignoraunt, bicause *Sotcliff* is, or that a. of them. *For an ill logician.*

vveare a vvodden legge, bicause *Dauid Dee* did so. Yet vvill I not deny, but that heresie, vvhich is an infidelitie tovvards God, is a great spurre to infidelitie tovvards men: and therfore *S. Hieron* saith, *haereticus nec iuxta creditur nec diabolo*: but yet sometymes natur ouer cōmeth heresie, as vvee see in the Germain and Suice Lutheranes and Zuinglians, vvho are heretikes euen to *Sotcliff* and his Protestaunts and Puritans, and yet retain in some sort their ancient and hereditarie sinceritie and faithfulnes. As for vs, vvhom *Sotc.* calleth Papists, I knovv not hovv he can iustly charge vs vvith vnfaithfulnes tovvards men, vvhose vvord, as he knovves, vvil be taken before a Ministers obligation. Vvherfore *Sarisburi.* saith, that it is novvaduersa 10. most a prouerb, that it is more sure to deal vvith a papistical, then an Euāgelical merchaūt. Queen Elizabeth sayd once, that if she vvere to pry a freind in necessitie, shee vvould soener rely vpon the old Lord Montagues fidelitie, then on the faith of a Protestaunt or Puritane.

Sotcl. first reason.

1. Yet let vs heare hovv vvisely this man proueth that Papists keep no faith to men? *Because* (saith he) *they teach that no faith is to be kept to heretikes.* Here vvee see he retournes to his former fault, stil concluding vniuersally out of a particuler proposition, and prouing that Papists generally keep not touch vvith men, bicause they teach that promises and debtes, may be deliyed to certain men, that is heretikes, and not al heretikes, but only those that are namelie declared heretikes by publike sentence. For their goods are adiuged to the

Cap absolutos. de haeret. Alph. 1 Catech. 1 Bellarm. de iustif. lib. 4 de pœnit. c 7. Simāc de Cath. Instit. 46. n. 73. Azor. 18 c. 13.

Fiscal, and so debtes dewe to them, are not to be payed to them but to the Fiscal. And if *Sote.* will hence inferre, that Papists keep no faith to men and therfore are heretikes: he may as well say, that Ciuilians teach that a man is not bound to stand to his promise or guift made to vngratefull persons, *ergo* they teach that faith is not to be kept to men, and so are heretikes. hee might add also that the same Ciuilians teach that if a man promise a thing vnlawfull, or that he will not recal his Testament, he is not bound to stand to such a promise: so the common lawyers in England, teach that traitours goods and debtes being confiscated are not to be payed to them, but to the King: *ergo* they teach that faith is not to be kept to men, and so are all heretikes: vnles *Sote* be an euil Logician, who concludeth vniuersally out of particulers. And if *Sotel.* answer that the Ciuilians and common lawyers teach that faith generally is to be kept to men, though not to certain men, for certain offences; the same do I answer for the Catholike Church. For she generally teacheth and commaundeth to pay debtes and to keep promises: and so *Nauar, Sotus, Antonimus, Couarruuias*, and all do teach, and that in twoe respects. First in respect of fidelitie, which is to be obserued in words, for if no man stand to his word, conuersation and Societie can not stand. Secondly in respect of iustice, bicause a promise made, giueth to him that accepts it, a kind of right to the thing promised, which diuines cal *ius ad rem*, and so iniurie is done vnto him, if the promise made be

l fin. de reuo. donat. l. pacta C. de pactis.

Nau. c. 18. Sot. l 7. q. 2. a. 1. Ant. 2. p. tit. 10. ca. 1. §. 4. Couar. in c. quamuis peccatum §. 4. l. 51 quis arge-tum. C de Donat. Caiet. 22. q. 113. a. 1.

not perfourmed. Yet the Church iustly confiscateth heretikes goods and debtes, they being Traitours to Christe and his Church.

Æquiuocation.

3. Peraduentur *Sotcliff* vvil alleage, that Catholikes teach that it is lavvful to æquiuocat, and so do not stand to their vvords in that meaning in vvhich they are ordinarily taken: for this they haue obiected to some Priests and Iesuits, vvho to saue their ovvn or other mens liues, haue equiuocated: & one hath made an absurd *Eglogue*, vvhich he hath intitled *Pseudelus*, in vvhich he vvould make a shovv to the vvorld, hovv detestable this fault is in Catholikes. But vvhen I shal haue declared our opinion therin, noe man of intelligence, can reprehend the doctrine. Plato in deed vvas of opinion, that it vvas lavvful not only to æquiuocate but also to lye in some case, so that the lye be vsed as a medicin, that is, to auert some great euill or to procure some great good. *Cicero* thought a man might decline some vvhat from the truth for a freinds sake. Vvhich opinion *Castanus* and some others haue imbraced. But that this opinion is false *S. Austin* hath proued out of Scriptur, and comonly our diuines do subscribe vnto him, affirmig that to lye is so intrinsecally euil, that it is not lavvfull though it vvere to saue a freinde, yea a kings life and kingdoms vveale. So *Pericles* being desired of a friend, to auert an vntruth for his sake, answvered *δει μη συμπεσοντων ημιν φιλοις αλλα μαλλον θεοις*: *vve must assist our freinds, but euen to the Godds*, that is as farr as God his lavv permitteth, insinuating that it permitted not to lye

l. 3. de Repub.

l. de Amicitia.

col 17. c 5 l. 1. de mendacio.

Tho. 2. 2. q. 110. art. 113.

Ex Aul. Gel. l. 1 Noct. Att. c. 3

euen for our freind. The reason of this is, because God & natur hauing giuen vs a tongue to expres to others our harts meaning (for that vve desire of them, and they of vs) if our vvords accord not vvith our meaning, vvee lye, and sinne in contradicting the ordinaunce of God and natur, and as much as in vs lyeth, vve destroy al conuersation and societie. For if vvhen one promiseth a thing he meaneth not to perform it, if vvhen he telles you that he loues you, he hates you from the hart, if vvhen he saith one thing, he thinketh another, vvee can neuer besure of him, and so can haue no conuersation vvith him. For this cause vvee condemne also dissimulation and hypocrisie, vvhich is, vvhen in deeds and external signes, vve make a shovv of one thing, yet mynd another. So farr vve are from allovving any lye that vve cõdemne not only the pernicious ly, vvhich is vvhen by lying vve cause hurt to our neighbourg, but also the officious ly, vvhich, is vvhẽ vve tel an vntruth for our ovvn or others commoditie, yea and the merrie lye also called *mendacium iocosum*, vvhen vve lye only to delight our selues or others. But as for æquiuocation, vve hold it in some cases for lavvfull: for although it be neuer lavvful to say one thing and mean another, bicause that is to lye, yet may vvee hide our meaning by vsing vvords vvhich the hearer taketh in one meaning, vvee in another sense; vvhich vve conceale from him. For this is not to lye, bicause the vvordes are conformable to the speakers, though not to the hearers vveening, but it is only to æquiuocat. And this

Lying vnlavvful.

Dissimulation vnlavvfull.

Æquiuocation sometymes lavvfull.

2. manners of æquiuocation.

may be done in two manners. First by vsing amphibological & ambiguous speeches, which may be taken in diuers meanings: as when the Oracle sayd *Aio te, Æacida Romanos vincere posse.* For if the words haue two significatiõs, the speaker may vse them in that which is most for his purpose, though hee know the heares will take him in the other meaning. as if *Sotcliff* were called Peacock, yet being demaunded whether he bee not Peacock, should answer no, as loth to be known, meaning that he is not the fowle called a Peacocke: Secondly we may æquiuocat by words which haue but one significatiõ, which yet with a mental addition, haue another secret signification much different, but yet true also. As if one that hath no Authoritie, should demaund of the theef, whether he did such a robberie, and the theef should answere he did not: meaning that he did not in his presence. For although, that denial seeme a lye, yet it is not: because it is conformable to the speakers meanig, which he keepeth secret, and is not bound to open alwayes and to al men, especially to his own preiudice. So like wise one coming frõ a citie infected with the plague, to another citie not infected, if he be demaunded whether he came from that citie? he may say noe, if hee be sure he is not him selfe infected, meaning that hee came not from thence infected or touched with y^e^ infectiõ: for in so answering he lyeth not, because he speaketh true according to his meaning, yea & the meaning also which y^e^ Keepers of the Gate of the Citie should haue: &

although they take him in the ordinarie meaning yet he is not bound to take that error from them to his owvn preiudice. This second manner of æquiuocating, *Sotus*, *Caietan*, and some fevv others do condemne, though (as vve haue seen) it is noe lye: but as for the first manner, they admitt it as lavvfull, and others commonly as *Nauar*, *Siluester*, *Angelus*, *Adrian*, *Maior*, *Tolet*, and *Gregorie*, of *Valentia*, do approue both, bicause nether are lyes, but truthes in the speakers meaning: and they affirm also that vvhen iust cause is, vve may svveat vvhen vvee may æquiuocat, bicause vvee svveare but truth in our owvn meaning. And certes to condemne al æquiuocation is to condemne al stratagems in vvarr, in vvhich a showv is made of one thing, and another is meaned. and it is to make al figuratiue speeches lyes, bicause in them is meant another thing then the vvordes in their ordinarie signification do import: as vvhen S. Ihon called Christ a light, and he him selfe called him selfe, a vine, a dore, and his Apostles light and salt. Yea to condemne al æquiuocation, is to condemne the holy Patriarches and Christ him selfe for egregious lyers. For *Iacob*, sayd to *Isaac* his Father, that heevvas his eldest sonne *Esau*, vvhich, if vve respect the vvordes as ordinarily they are taken, seemeth a lye, but in his secret meaning is a truth, bicause as *S. Ambrose* sayth, he meant that he vvas *Isaacs* eldest sonne, not by natur, but by office and right. The same *Isaac* called *Rebecca*, his sister, as *Abraham*, before called *Sara*, meaning cousin. And did not the Angel *Raphael* æquiuocat, vvhen hee sayd he

Sot. l. 3. q. 1. a. 7. ad 4. Cajet. 1. 2. q. 89. a. 7. Nau. c. 12. n. 8, 9 19. Silu. v. Iur. 3. q. 2. Ang. v. Iur. 5. Adr. in 4. q de S. gl. Tol. l. 4. c. 11. l. 5. c. 13. Greg. val. 1. 2. disp 3. q 13. p. 2. disp. 6. q. 7 p. 4. æquiocationes proued by Scripture.

Io 1. Mat. 5.

Gen. 27. Ambr. l. 1. de Iacob

Gen. 26. 10. 11.

Tob. 5.

vvas *Maria*? certes ether he equiuocated or lyed bicause Angels are nether fathers nor sonnes. but to say he lyed is absurd he being blessed, *ergo* he æquiuocated. Did not Christ æquiuocat vvhen he sayd, S. Ihon vvas *Helias*, meaning not in person, as that vvord commonly is taken, but in likenes of *Helie* and office? Did he not æquiuocate again, vvhen he told his Apostles that he vvould not ascend to Hierusalé, meaning that he vvould not ascend openly and vvith them? Vvhen he sayned he vvould go further then *Emaus*, vvhat did he but æquiuocate? Did he not tel his Disciples that he knevv not the day of Iudgemẽt, meaning that hee knevv it not as a thing vvhich he might tel to them? I could alleage many examples of Saintes also that haue practised this, but I vvil cõtent my self vvith this of *S. Athanasius*: vvho hauing vnderstood that *Iulianus*, had adiudged him to Exile, and cõmaunded a Count to pursue him and to Kil him, tooke shipping to escape by Sea, but being at his landing in a place, aduertised, that he vvas pursued; contrarie to the counsel of his freinds, vvho vvished him to hide him selfe in a desert, he retourned to meet his enemies. They neuer suspecting that *Athanasius*, vvould retourn to meet them, demaunded of him, vvhether he had met *Athanasius*, and hovv farr of he vvas? he told them that he passed but a vvhile since & vvas not farr of: so they followved in vain and he by meeting them escaped. for this stratagem, no Historiographer condemneth *Athanasius*, and yet he could not be excused but by equi-

Mat. 11.

Ioh. 7.

Luc. 24.

Marc. 13.

ex Ruff. l. 1. cap. 34. Theodor. l. 3. c. 9

occasion. Yea it seemeth that God reuealed this to him, for he at his departur, bad the *Alexãdrians* not to be astonished at this his banishment and flight, for saith he, *it is but a cloud which will soon passe*, insinuating that he knevv by reuelation that he should retourn, and peraduentur by the same reuelation, vvas certified of the mãner by vvhich he should retourn.

4. And I vvould demaund of *Sotcliffe* a question not vnlike, to the Questions vvhich are proposed to Catholikes, to knovv vvhat they vvould do if the Pope or King of Spain should enter the land vvithan armie. In this case (vvhich is but a metaphisical case) if the Popes or the King of Spains souldiours should demaund of *Sotcliff* to knovv vvher the King, Queen, and their noble issue is, that so they might dispatch them, I demaund of *Sotcliff*, if he knevv vvhere they vvere, vvhat he vvould answver? Vvould he say plainly vvithout al mental restri ction or addition that he knovves not that vvere to ly, vvhich is not lavvful to saue a1000. Kings and Kingdoms. Vvould he tel them the place? that vvere to betray most traiterously his King and countrie. Vvould he deny to tel them? that vvere to expose him selfe to torments yea to death it selfe. He must then say he knovves not, meaning, to *tel them*. or else he must lye, vvch is a sinne against God, or he must confesse, vvhich is treason against his Prince, or he must deny to confesse, vvhich is to be accessorie to his ovvn death, or æquiuocate, and so nether preiudice him selfe, nor offend God, nor betray his Prince.

a demãd.

But these men that cry out of æquiuocation, for lesse causes then this, would lye and redouble the lye: and so might they lawfully also, if (as *Calum* teacheth) God willeth and worketh our sinnes: for then a lye is the work of God, and according to his will.

l. 1. Inst. c 18.

5. This I haue sayd, bicause I hear in England, æquiuocation is taken very hainously, to shew how in some cases it is lawfull: but yet not meaning therby to giue to great scope. For when a lawful Iudge lawfully proceeding, inquireth, the guiltie is bound to answere according to his meaning, else he should neuer know the truth, which would be more præiudicial to the common welth then the death of the guiltie; though in this case also, some hold it lawful to æquiuocate, if otherwise the guiltie bee to dye, and bee in hope also to escape death by æquiuocating. Likewise when we are examined publiquely, though before an vnlawful Iudge, of our Religion, we must confesse plainly, least we seem to be ashamed of Christ and his faith, and so our Preists confesse plainly that they are Catholikes, bicause that is a name of their Religion: but they may deny them selues Preists, meaning traiterous Preists, or they may put their accusers to proue it, bicause that is a name of their state of life, which they are not bound to disclose to their so great preiudice. And last of al, though when iust occasion is offered, it be lawful to æquiuocate, yet not vppon euerie trifling occasion. For though euen then, such æquiuocation be noe formal lye,

Th. 22. q. 69. a. 1. Cajet. ibid Sch. 3. in 4 d. 15 iv. Sol. de teg. secret. m. 2 q 7. Nauc. c. 15 n. 53 conar qq pract q 3 Gomez to 3. c. 12. n. 5.

but a truth in the speakers meaning, yet it is equiuolent in effect to lying, because it ruinateth Societie and Conuersation no lesse then lying, and so it a sinne, vvhich is reduced to lying. For if a man æquiuocat vppon euerie occasion, vvee can haue no more assurance of him, then on a lyer. And so lying is alvvayes vnlavvful, equiuocating sometymes lavvfull, & plain dealing is a treasure. But if breaking of vvords and promises, and not keeping faith to men, be a marke of an heretike, hovv fovvlie are *Sorduff* and his ministers branded and begrimed? For although God both in the old and nevv lavve, allovved vovves and forbadd to breake them: yet *Luther* repeateth nothing so often, as that vovves vvhich are promises to God, may and must be broken, and as he taught, so he practised, vvhen he a Friar, maried vvith a *Nunne*, contrarie to both their promises: Caluin suscribing, saith that vovves are no band vnto vs. And then say I, if promises to God may be broken, much more may promises to men. The same men of God affirm that Christ hath freed vs from al povver of men, in so much that their lavvs can not bynd vs in conscience, and then say I, that promises and contracts, vvhich are but particuler lavves, vvhich by mutual consent men præscribe to them selues, are not necessarilie to be kept. I haue proued also in this secõd booke that al the nevv Christians of this age are heretiques, vvherefore followeth that they haue broken their promise made to Christ and his Church in Baptisme, and vvhich is vvorst, do persist in the

Num. 6 15. 11. 30. Deut. 23. 1. Reg. 15. Psal. 11. 75. Eccl. 5. 1. Tim. 3. Luth. l. de vot. Monast. li de cap. Bab. & de vita coelugali. Calu. l. 4. Inst. c. 13. § 11. Luth. in c. 2. ep. 1. Pet. Calu. li 3. inst. c. 19. Reformers by their doctrin may breake promises.

same. And so if *not keeping faith to men*, be a mark of
Sotcl. 2. reason. an heretike, how deformed an heretike is this our Minister?

7. His second reason, to proue that vvee Keep no faith to men, is, bicause *Papists* (as he saith) *dispense vvith oathes most easilie*, and *the Rhemists in their Annotations vppon the 13. of the Acts do expressly teach them falsly vvord to breake their oathes, and to run into vvilfull periurie*. But if *Sotcliff* in this be conuinced to run into vvilfull lying, vvho *Keepe his faith to men*, vvotse then he? Vve teach in deed, contrarie to the *Messalians* and *Pelagians*, *Vvaldens* and *Puritans*, that to svveare vvith devv circumstances is a laudable act of Religion, practised in the lavv of *Nature*, of *Moyses*, and of *Christe*, by the greatest Saints: as by *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Iacob*, *Moyses*, *Dauid*, *Saint Paul*, yea by *God* him selfe. Yet do vve not licence men to svvear at pleasur. For vve acknovvledg that as medicins are not absolutly good, but only suppoOathes lavvful. Ex Aug. ep. 89 Dah. de 100. hæres. Cathe. v. Iuramentum Instit. 40. Concord. 02. 21. 26 31 Deut 6. Psal. 62. Rom. 1. 2. Cor. 1. Phil. 1. 1. Tim. 5. Psal. 49. 109 Heb. 6. sing a disease, so oathes are not absolutly good or absolutly to be vsed, but only supposing a necessitie and a disease of mens infidelitie, vvho vvill not credit a bare affirmation, vnless it be seconded vvith an oath: and therfore vvhen this necessitie is not, svvearing is forbidden, vvhen this necessitie vrgeth, it is commaunded by *God*, and cõmended by *Dauid*. And good reason. For vvhen vvithout an oath vve can not be beleeued, and yet it importeth vve should be beleeued: by svvearing vve acknovvledge God to be so vvise that he knovveth al, so true that he vvil not patronize a lye, so Great that he is Greater then our se-
Isa. 5 48 5. & 33. Deut. 6. Psal 62.
Heb. 6.

ues, bicause *no mā ſweareth but by a Greater*: ſo good that he is vvorthy our loue, bicause no man ſvveareth by that he hateth. And vvhen for ſuch an oath, our vvords are beleeued, vve are honoured bicause vve are credited, God is honoured, bicauſe for his name vve vvere credited, our neighbour is benefited, vvhen the truth is cleared, and vve vvith him are contented, vvhen ſo the controuerſie is ended. But if vve ſvveare vvithout iuſt cauſe, vve take Gods name in vain, if for euerie litle matter, vve make lide eſteem of ſo great a maieſtie, if vve ſvveare often, vve are often tymes for ſvvorn. If then vvee vvil haue our oathes to be free from ſinne, vve muſt neuer let them be free from theſe three companions, *Iudgement*, *Veritie*, *Iuſtice*. *Iudgement*, is neceſſarie in the ſvveater, *Veritie* in the thing he ſvveareth, *Iuſtice* in the cauſe for vvhich he ſvveareth. For vvant of *Iudgement*, the oath is raſh, for vvant of *Veritie* it is falſe, for vvant of *Iuſtice*, it is vnlavvfull. And he that ſvveareth vvithout *Iudgement*, vſeth Gods name in vain, he that ſvveareth vvith out *Iuſtice* makes God Patron of iniquitie, he that ſvveareth vvithout *Veritie*, makes him a vvitneſſe to a lye. The firſt is againſt his Reuerence, the ſecond againſt his Goodnes, the third againſt his *Veritie*. And vvhen vvith theſe companions vve ſvveare, vvee ſinne not in ſvvearing, but yet if vee keep not our oath vve ſinne in forſvvearing: for if naked promiſes do oblige vs (as before) much more do oathes. Yet if the thing vvee ſvveare, vvas, or proue to be vnlavvfull, vve are not bound to keep it, yea vve muſt not

Vvhen oathes are lavvfull. Hieron. ſuper Ieremiam. 4. & 5. q. c. Animaduertendum. 3. companions of oathes.

In Decreto. cauſa. 22. q. 4. c. Si aliquid.

keepit. If it can not be kept without great Preiudice, the Ecclesiastical Iudge & Superiour may dispense in it, and in some cases the Prince, as if the oath was extorted, or proue praeiudicial to our health or the common wealth. For although oathes and promises bynd vs by lavv of *God* and *Nature*, yet bicause it much concerneth the common wealth, that oathes and promises be kept or not kept, it was requisit that the superiour shold haue power, when iust cause is, to release them or to declare them in such a case not to bynd. and according to this wee fynd many dispensations in oathes, both in the Canon and Ciuil lavv.

In Decretal Tit. de Iure iurando. l. 1 2. C. Si aduersus vendit.

8. Vvheras *Sot:* chargeth the *Rhemists in their Annotations vppon the 23. of the Acts to haue expressly taught their followers to break their oathes and to runne into wilful perurie*, that is a vvilful calumnie. For he knovves, if he haue read the place, that the *Rhemists* say only, that oathes and vovves of vnlavvful things, are euilly made, and vvorse performed. Such vvas the vovve of the Iewes, vvho in the place alleaged, *vovved not to eate til they had killed Paul*: Such vvas *Herods* oath, vvho rashly svvore to his dauncing daughter, that he vvould giue her vvhat soeuer she demaunded, and vvickedly performed his oath in graunting her *S. Iohn Baptists* head. The reason is, bicause vve cā not be bound to sinne, and so a vovv or oathe made of an vnlavvful thing, can not bynd vs, and consequently it is a sinne to fulfill such a vovv or oath. So the Rhemists say, if an oath be proposed to a Catholike to accuse other Catholikes, for seruing

The notes of the Rhemes Test cleared.

Act. 23. Marc 6.

God by hearing or saying masse, it is one sinne to take this oath, and another to perfourm it. Vvhich their assertion must stand for true, till *Sotcliff* and his ministers can disproue the *Masse*.

## Sotcliffes eleuenth marke.

*THe liues of heretikes are verie loud and loose*, libera sunt illis omnia & soluta, *saith Tertullian l. præscrip. Theodoret l. 1. hæret. fab. in præfat. saith their obscenitie is such that the stageplayers vvould be ashamed to speak or hear it. And vvhat he saith not, vve may imagin by the Popes of Rome, &c.*

### Kellison.

1. BE it that Papists liues vvere vitious, yet, *qui alterum incusat probri, ipsum se integrum oportet*: and it is absurd that the kettle, should cal the kill burntayl. For vvho more vitious thē the Protestaunts and Puritanes? Hovv then dareth *Sotcliff* make euil life a marke of an heretike? Papists sayth he are vitious. Be it so, and are you Saints or lesse vitious? Or since you appeared in the vvorld, is that part of the vvorld vvhere you raign, more reformed in manners? I graunt that vertues and good vvorkes, though they do not necessarilie follovv faith (for some Catholikes liue farre othervvise then their Religion teacheth them) yet commonly they are the frutes of faith, and therfore so soone as Christian Religion vvas planted in the vvorld, barbarisme gaue place to ciuilitie, and vice to vertue, the ofsprings of true faith. Vvherfore *Iustinus Martyr*, *Minutius Felix*, *Athenagoras*, and *Tertullian*, vvriting Apologies for the

Plutarch.

Good life of the first Christias.

Iust. or at. ad Anton. Minut. in

Octau. Ath. in oratt. pro Christ. Tert. Apo. cap 39 41. 44 45. lib aduers. Scap. in initio. Philo ex Euſ. li. 2. hiſt. c 17 Euſeb. l 1 præp. Euāg c. 3.

Christians, commend their chaſtitie, charitie, patience, fidelitie, faſting, auſteritie of life, and ſuch like vertues. *Philo* the Ievv admireth the prayers, almeſdeeds, voluntarie pouertie, abſtinence, chaſtitie, and charitie of the Christians cathechiſed by *S. Mark* at *Alexandria*: the like report maketh *Euſebius*. *Tertullian* ſaith that the Gentiles beholding the charitie of Christians ſayd *behold how they loue one another and how they are ready to die for one another.* And this faith, as in the vvorld generally, ſo in euerie cōuntrie particulerly, cauſed a great mutation in manners, as the hiſtories of the conuerſions of particuler countries do remōſtrate. And though in tyme, al nations haue degenerated frō their firſt Sanctitie, as Germanie, Fraunce, England, & other countries had done before *Lutheraniſm*, & *Caluiniſm*. (for vice is the fore runner of hereſie, and the end of our good life, vvas the beginning of your Religiō) yet by this nevv faith & the nevv preachers therof, vvas it neuer abettered in māners, but rather more deformed, as many liuing can tel, vvho haue been eye-vvitneſſes. Yea let them that leaue the Catholike Church, to incorporate them ſelues in this nevv Synagogue ſpeake true and ſhame the deuill, and they vvill ſay, I ame ſure, that they haue not reformed their manners therby: and let them likevviſe, vvho dayly from their Church, retourn to ours, ſpeake as it is in deed, and they vvill confeſſe, that of Ruffians, they are become modeſt, of diſſolute, chaſte, of irreligious, deuout, of drūkards, ſober, of glottons, great faſters, of couetous, almeſgiuers, of

A cōparison of Catholiques and her liues.

couſo-

tousoners, vpright in dealing, of consciencles; scrupulous, and exemplair in al good conuersation: and those that are naughtie liuers amongest vs, they are not vvorse then you are, and neuer the better by running to you. Vvherfore in England vvhere Catholikes and Protestauntes liue pelmel together, a Catholikes vvord vvil be taken euen of Protestaunts, before a Protestaunts obligatiō; and if a man fast, or praye extraordinarilie, or shevv any chast behauiour or modestie, he is suspected for a Papist, vvhich is a sign that you giue good life to vs. And let your prisons speake, vvhich of you or vs, are the greatest malefactours. For as *Tertullian* sayd once to the Pagans in defence of Christians, so say I to you in defence of Catholikes; *de vestris æstuat carcer &c. Your prison is so full of yours, that it is boate vvith them. vve Catholikes are there, but only because they are Catholikes, or if for other crimes, they ceased to be Catholikes before for such faultes they were cōmitted.* And vvhatsoeuer Catholikes in England or other countries bee nowv, at their first conuersion they vvere most holy and Innocent, as the histories of their conuersions do vvitnesse, but as for you, you vvere neuer good. and although the Religious be neuer so deuout as vvhē he vvas a nouice, nor the scholler so studious as the first yeare, nor the souldiour so vigilāt as vvhen he vvas a beginner, yet you in the beginning vvere in liues abominable, yea your beginners and first Founders vvere no better, and their first Scholliers vvere like their Maisters. Vvhat *Luther, Carolstadius, Zuinglius, Caluin, Be-*

Tertul. in Apol. c. 44

As and others vvere, Cochlæus, Stapilton, Bolsec, Pighius, and some not Catholikes haue vvritten, vvhose bookes are ful of their turpitudes and abominations: and yet in these sinkes the vvorld forsooth, vvas to be vvashed, & by these disclouds vvere vvere to be vviped. Or if these men vvere Saints (as our Fox maketh them) certes their first Schollers vvould haue shevved it in their manners? Let vs heare then vvhat they them selues say of their Schollers, and of the reformation of manners vvhich they haue made: for sure, they vvil not ly to their ovvn prejudice.

Hereukes complaint of their evil life.

Luther. in postil. Dom. 1. Aduent.

Luther cõfesseth the vvorld is vvorse since his preaching.

Luther. in sermone conuiuial. germ. an. fol. 55 the like fol. 623. & põ. 26. post Trinit.

Mel. in ca. 6. Matth cõfesseth the same.

Brentius in kervvise in c. 3. Matt.

1. Luther the first brevver of this nevv heare, and broocher of this vvine, in vvhich is nought but luxuries: hath made vs this confession: *Mundus de die in diem multo exterior euadit quod possimus dæmones præsentire &c.* The vvorld is every day vvorse then other, vvhich the deuil vvotteth (but by you) for vvee feele the same: nevv a dayes are much vvorse, more cruel, more hold sinning, more libidinous, then euer they vvere before in Papacie. And again: *Mirabile ex pleno effrenatio mundi est, quod ab eo tempore quo primum puri Euangelij doctores incepere euangelizare, mundus de die in diem deterior euasit, Christiana libertate abutitur nemo fere ac si omnibus quibuslibet facere cessisset per licentiam.* Melanthon saith that in his tyme in Germanie, ther vvas nothing elle almost but drinking and eating, in vvhich and other vices, they vvallovvved them selues like svvine. Brentius lamenteth that *Tanta est mollitie corruptela in temporibus &c. Such ouerflovv of sinners is in these tymes, such hudge of sinne &c. that vve seeme to haue no reason to trust in god vvorth, for vvhat should he repent vve trust so that vve*

haue not? Andreas Musculus: It goeth so vvith vs Lutherans (saith he) as it vvere a man vvould see a huge company of Mules, turbulent persons, traine, impastours, vsurers, let him go to a Citie in vvhich the Ghospell purely (that is as hee meaneth Lutheranically) is preached, and there he shal find them. Hee addeth that amongest Turkes and Infidels; you shal not finde more such, then amongest the Ghospellers, amongest vvhom al bridles are loosed to the deuil. *Facilius inuenies turcas, iudeos, &c.* that they are taught, that by only faith in Christ they are saued, and therefore they let al good vvorkes goe: that al the vvorld may know, that they are no Papists, they trust not to good vvorkes nether do they exercise any good vvorke. *Caluin*, calleth his owne Caluinists, *omnium monstrorum scelestissimos & sceleratissimos, vetera & nostra & nulli vnquam humanam formam induta*, the most vvicked of al men, cruel monsters, and euil spirits in the shape of men. The like coplaintes the Magdeburgians haue. Vvherefore I frame this Syllogisme. Those Christians are heretikes vvho commonly are of lovvd and loose life, but *Sectaries* brethren are such, ergo they are heretikes. The *maior* is *Sectaries*, The *minor*, is *Euident*, confirmed by *Melanthon. Brentius, Caluin*, the Magdeburgians, and other *Sectaries* Maisters. The conclusion is myne, vvhich is, that *Sectaries* and his fellovves are heretikes. To vvhich one *Paulus Eberus* subscribeth in these vvords, *Nec mala eorum vnusquisque proprijs oculis intuetur, merito dubitat in vester Euangelicus cœtus vera sit Ecclesia, in qua tot sunt schismata & dissidia, in qua tot & tam enormia vitia cōstituntur*, vvhith euils vvhen euery one beholdeth vvith

So Andr. Musc. 1. Adu.

So Iac. Andrez de bonis & malis Germ.

Conc. 10. Gallicè scripto in ep. Ephes.

Cent. 7. c. 7. pag. 1110.

Præfat. in com. Phil. in ep. Corinth.

*his owne eyes, he vvorthilie doubteth, vvhether our Euangelical company be the true Church, in vvhich are so many Schismes and diuisions, in vvhich so many and so enormous vices are seen.*

3. But *Sotcliff* saith that at *Rome*, Stevves are publiquelie permitted. But hovv I pray you? they are not permitted as lavvfull, bicause such are holden to liue in damnable State, and therfore are not admitted to Sacraments, nor Christian burical, but only are vvinked at, to auoid a greater euil, and vvith such hard conditions they are permitted, that the permission is a punishment. For they are mulcted, & not suffred to liue but in certain places, vvher to liue is infamie, euen as in tyme of plague, certain hovvses are deputed, least al should be infected: vvheras in *London*, and other your Cities, in euerie Inne almost, this vice is tolerated, and greater search there is after Priests then hoares and hoare-maisters. And vvhy doth *Sotcliff* challing good life to his companiõs, seing that *Luther*, his great Grand-father, telles *Erasmus*, that of him and his, *Sanctitie, and miracles, are not to be required, they denying them to be necessarie*, but only of Catholikes, vvho deem them as necessarie.

l. de seruo arbitrio.

Popes liues.

4. Vvheras *Sotcliff* accuseth Popes *of abominable beast-liues*, he is an abominable beast, to impute great crimes to so great Personages, and yet neither name the Popes, nor proue the crimes. I vvil not deny but that some haue been lesse exemplair then the place they fill, and the person they sustein required, but yet they are not so many as that *Sotcliff* may pronounce generally of them. The

first thirtie, vvere Martyrs: to Gregorie the first there are numbred 60. Popes canonized: the Popes *Damasus*, also, *Martin*, *Agatho*, *Leo* the second *Constantin*, *Leo* the fourth, *Leo* the ninth, *Stephen* the ninth, *Alexander* the second, *Martin* the fourth, *Celestin* the second, *Benedict* the tenth, *Gregorie* the seuenth, & others, vvrought miracles, and many others not canonized nor indevved vvith the guift of miracles, vvere of great learning and exemplair life: and many of them that are accused, as *Liberius*, *Felix* the second, *Honorius* the first, *Syluester* the second, *Gregorie* the seuenth, are cleared most euidently, by *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, *Bozius*, *Cocus*, and others. In so much that *Luther* in his *Declaration of certain Articles*, saith, *Quod Romana Ecclesia sit à Deo & pra omnibus aliis honoranda, non est dubium. 33. Petrus & Paulus, 46. Romani Pontifices, & ut extrema mittam Martyrum, sanguineum suum fuderunt, infernum & mortem vicerunt, vt vel palpari queat quam singularem habeat ad illam Ecclesiam respectum. Quod si mutas, &c.* That the Romain Church is of God, before al others to be honored, ther is no doubt. S. Peter and S. Paule, yea six Romain Bishops, and so many hundred thousand Martyrs haue shed their blood and haue ouercome hel and death, that it may euen be felt, vvhat a singuler respect God hath to that Church. And if nowv, alas, the matter go vvith at Rome, as it vvere expedient it vvent better, yet nether is ther any other cause, nether can ther be so great, that a seperation or departur from that Church should be made. So that if lewd life be a marke of an heretike, then is Sorcliff an heretike by his ovvn maisters confession. But yet to say the truth, this is no mar-

Ex Bozio to. 1. l. 1. de sign. Eccl. c. 3. n. 1.

Bell to. 1. Baron. in Annal. Boz de signis. Cocus to. 1. l. 7. Thesaur. Luth. declar. quorundi Artic.

ke to discern an heretike from a Catholike, for some heretikes may liue vvel morally, at least for some tyme, as the Pelagians did, and many Catholikes may liue vitiously, and not according to their faith and doctrin, and so this rather serueth to make Sorcliff for a Sorte, then Papists for heretikes.

## Sorcliffes 12. marke.

*They excel al men in pride and vvil but haue their dignitie examined: herin they resemble Mahumet, vvho vvould not haue any question made of his lavv. But the Pope exceedeth both Mahometans and al other heretikes, he vvil be honoured as God. If he should draw innumerable soules vvith him to Hel yet vvil he not be vexed for it, as appeareth by the chap. Si Papa distinct. 40. His determinations ex cathedra vvere held, as infallible.*

## Answere.

1. THis marke vvas necessarie to make vp a browne dozen, and vvas left for the vpshoot, to proue *Papists* not only heretiques, but *Turkes* also and *Mahometans*. But I feare it vvil proue like the rest and vvorthy the marker. I vvil not deny but that pride is alvvayes ioyned vvith heresie, for an heretike is he vvho præferreth his ovvn opinion before the Church of God, Councels and fathers: vvhich as it is the greatest vvaddes, so is it the greatest pride that is. Therfore S. *Austin* saith, *that an heretike is hee vvho for some temporal commoditie and especially for glorie and præeminence, either de-*

Vvho is an heretique. Mat 18.

l. de vtilit. credendi, in init.

with false and new opinions, or followeth them. This pride, saith Sotc. is incident to Popes. and how proues he that? First (saith he) the Pope will be honoured as God. If this were true it were indeed an intolerable pride. But neither doth our bold Dean proue this, neither can he. The Pope indeed calles him selfe the *Vicar* of Christ, but that is not to equalize him selfe vnto him, because the Vicar is not the Prince, nor the Viceroy the King. Which is an argument, by the way, that you absurdly cal the *Pope Antichriste*, seing that *Antichrist* shal extoll him selfe aboue *Christ*, and oppose him selfe against him, the Pope acknowledgeth him selfe to be vnder Christe, and not opposite to him, but as much for him, as the viceroy or deputie is, or should be for the King. Peraduenture Sotc. dreameth (which yet he alleageth not) of that *chapter* of the *Canon Iuris*, in which the *Pope* is called *God*. But the answer is ready, to wit, that *Pope Nicholas* to proue that *Michael* th Emperour had no authoritie to depose Bishops, alleageth how *Constantine*, when certain Bishops at the Counsel of Nice offered billes of contentions vnto him, answered, that they had power ouer him, and that they were his *Godds* according to that of the Psalme, *God stood in the Synagogue of Gods, iudging the Gods in the midst*, and consequently were not to be iudged of him, whence *Nicholas* the Pope inferreth that the Emperour can not depose Bishops, because so he should be their Iudge. So that not only Popes are called *Gods*, but also inferiour Bishops, but yet not Gods *per essentiam* but *per parti-*

Cap. 9. in d. 96.

Ex Soz. l. 1. c. 16. Ruff. c. 2.

Psa. 81.

*superiorum* as Iudges in Scriptur are called *Gods*, and thus also the Pope calleth not himselfe, but *Constantine* the great, so called him and al other Bishops. His second coniectur of the Popes pride, is, *because he will not haue his doctrine examined*. This his surmise is partly true, partely false. For before the Pope pronounceth sentence of matters of faith, both hee and his counsel (vvhich somtymes is a general Councel) do dispute and examin thinges and searche the scripturs, fathers, and tradition, to finde out the veritie. But vvhen, after due examination, the sentence is pronounced by him and his Councel (for he neuer defineth matters of faith vvithout former deliberation, consultation and information,) then he permitteth not to cal the definition in question, bicause he hath in that case infallible assistaunce of the holy Ghost as aboue I haue proued. and if a sentence pronounced by the cheefe Pastour and his Councel may bee censured, others may censure that sentence, and so vvee shal neuer haue an end. As for example, The Pope in the Councel of Trent and assembly of most of the Bishops of Europe, vvho could proue thē selues ordinarie and lavvful pastours, hath defined, that according to Scripture, Christs body is really in the Sacrament, that the Masse is a true Sacrifice, that there are 7. Sacraments, &c. If *Luther* then, *Caluin* and their Cubb *Sotcliff*, and a company of ministers, that can proue neither their ordination nor vocation, nor can agree amongest them selues, shal cal this sentence in question, and pronounce sentence against it,

Mat. 16. Io. 14. Luc. 22.

as they haue done: others may pronounce sentence vppon their sentence, and so *in infinitum*.

1. Certes the high priest in the old lavv caused them to be put to death (and by Gods commaundment also) that vvould not yeeld to his sentence, and shall our vnlearned minister *Setcliff*, count it pride in the Pope (vvho can proue him selfe by Scriptures, fathers and practise of the Church euer so haue been, and to haue been taken for the Suprem Pastour of the Church, as I also aboue haue proued) that hee vvill not haue his sentence, iuridically and vvith Counsel of his Bishops by him pronounced, examined and censured by euery Skipiack minister? That vvorthy Emperour *Constãtine* the great, vvould not examin the Counsel of *Nice*, but vvould haue it to be receiued *tanquam donum Dei & mandatum reuera cœlitus demissum*, as the guift of God and and a commandment verily sent downe from heauen. *Athanasius* demaundes vvith vvhat audacitie, after the authoritie of so great a Counsel as vvas that of *Nice*, men dare dispute and cal things by it defined, in question? *Cyrillus Alexandrinus* calles that Councel, *a base, and immoueable foundation of our soules*. The Emperours *Valentinian* and *Martian*, say that he doth iniurie to the most Religious Synod, *qui semel iudicata & recte disposita, reuoluere, & publicè disputare contendit*, &c. vvho contendeth to dispute of those things vvhich are once iudged and rightly disposed. *S. Ambrose* honoureth the *Counsel* of *Nice* as an oracle, and saith he vvil followv the tract of that Councel to death. *S. Hierom* in diuers places shevveth hovv much

Deut. 17.

Ep. ad Eccles de habita Nicæ Synodo.

Ep. ad Epictetum.

Dial. 1. cõ Hermia.

l. nemo. C. de summa Trinit.

in proem. l. 2. de fide ad Grat. & l. 2. c. 9.

Hie. ep 61 65. 17 l. 1 cont. R. ff.

Augu. ep 118. Greg li.1.ep.24. l.2. Indict. 11. ep.10. Calu. li.4. Inst. c.9 § 12.

he yeeldeth to Councels. *Austin* receueth those things that are decreed by general Councels, *quorum est in Ecclesia saluberrima authoritas*. S. *Gregorie* the Great reuerenceth the first fowre general Councels as the fowre Ghospells. And yet *Sotcliffe* with his Maister *Caluin*, *vvhom no names of Bishops or Councels can terrifie*, vvil pronounce sentence on their sentence, and by their spirit vvil examin vvhether they defined confirmably to Scripture, and so vvil examin, yet not suffer examination. Vvhich is greater pride then they can impute to the Pope, vvho neuer defineth, but after mature deliberation, Counsel, and information, and can prone also his authoritie, vvhich, al the Ministers in England can not. Vvheras *Sot.* alleaged the chapter cap. *Si Papa*, to prone, *that the Pope vvil not be saued though he should draw innumerable soules to hel after him*: he abuseth the text for those vvordes are not the vvordes of a Pope, but of S. *Boniface*, Bishop of Mogunce, and Martyr, vvho hauing spoken very honourably of the Pope and Sea of Rome, saith, that as his dignitie is great, so if his life answere not his dignitie, he draweth many to Hel vvith him, by his euil exaple, but yet is not to be iudged of any in earth, (though he may be admonished) because in earth he hath no Superiour.

But if pride be a marke of an heretike, how are *Sotcliffes* Fathers and brethren branded, vvho seem to contend vvith *Lucifer*, in pride and arrogancie? Vvhat greater pride then to assure them selues of their election and predestination? Vvhat greater pride then so take vppon them by their spirit

Spirit, to conclude vvhich is Scriptur and vvhat is ther mo amin? vvhat greater pride, then after so many Popes and Councels definition, after al the ciclent of the vvorld, to examin vvhat General Councels haue defined, and to prefer their singular Spirits before their general consent? But to descend to particulers, *Luther* in his booke against King Henrie the 8. vvith vvhat Luciferian pride doth he ivveil? To omit that he calleth the King also naught, and surnameth al Princes *Nittri*, there he preferres his doctrin before a thousand *Austins*, *Cyprians*, yea Churches: ther it is, that he vvil nether haue men nor Angels to be his Iudges, but by his doctrine, he vvil be Iudge of them and al the vvord. There he saith, *Ne placeri magis & magis superbire aduersus infelicissimos & inceptos Basiliscos, quo magis ipsi furunt.* There he saith, *vvee are not the Popes but his iurs, and vvy vve not to be Iudged of him, but he of vs, insomuch the spirituall man iudgeth al.* There he saith, *Et Erasmum plane Regi & Erasmo, vterum vtrum cerdo Daret animum diabolus.* And in another booke he vvrote, *against the Ecclesiastical order of Bishops*, he vaunteth that he is, *an Euangelist and Ecclesiastes of Christ, and therfor vvil not submit him selfe or his doctrin to the Iudgement of Bishops or Angels, but by his doctrin he vvil Iudge them.* And in his *Glosse against the pretended Edict Imperial*, thus he pronounced, as it vvere *ex Tripode*: *pro ego Doctor Martinus Lutherus Dominus noster Iesu Christi indignus Euangelista: I Doctor Martin Luther the vnvvorthy Euangelist of our Lord Iesus Christ, say, that that article, only faith vvithout any vvorke iustifieth before God, the Romane Emperours, Pope, al Cardinal*

*aduersus Regem Angl.*

Trotz. is a vvord of defiance.

lers, Bishops, Priests, Monkes, Nunnes, Kings, Princes, Lords, the whole world with al Deuils, must permit as firm and immoueable, and they must haue Hel fire on their heads and noe thankes. Be this the instinct from the Holy Ghost of Doctor Luther, the True and Holy Ghospel. He brageth that he will walke vppon Lions and Serpents, and Vul treade vppon the whelp of the Lion, and Dragon, of mee (saith he) S. Iohn Hus Prophecied, whom out of his prison he wrote from Constance to Beemland, Now they shal rost a goose (meaning him selfe) but after an hundred yeares, they shal heare a swanne singe whom they must endure, meaning, Martin Luther. And yet again he vaunteth, that if he be Killed in a Tumult, he will take an armie of Bishops, Preists and Monkes with him, that al shal say, Doctorem Martinum, magnae cum processione ad sepulturam deductum esse, ob enim magnum Doctor supra omnes Episcopos, Presbyteros & Monachos, that Doctor Martin is caried to his burial with a great procession, for he is a great Doctour aboue al Bishops, Preists and Monkes. And to proue him selfe from Luther to be transformed in to Luciferi Ruffianus (saith he) quod mille annis nemo hominum adeo bene testatus sit quemadmodum ego, qui nunc per multos annos verbum Dei puré docui, saepius vna die tres vel quatuor concones habui. Puto ego me quoque Augustino & Ambrosio in multitudine sermonum concionum similem esse. The Ministers of Zurich complayn of this his pride, saying that he glorieth that he is the Prophet and Apostle of the Germains, of whom al haue learned, he of none, and holdeth them excommunicated and heretikes, that will not accord to his sentence. Caluin, as Hieron. Bolser a Philitian of Geneue in Caluins tyme, & so one that could know

Ibidem.

No such thing in Hus his epistle.

In præmon. ad suos Germ.

In colloq. Lutheri de consolat.

In confess. Germ. impressa Tiguri ni, 1548.

Bolsec in vit. Calu.

more then by hear-say, vvriteth that *Caluin* in the heat of his sermons, vvas vvonted to cry: *I am a prophet, I haue the spirit of God, and I, if I erre, thou art, God, vvho for the sinnes of this people, hast deceiued me.* And vve haue hard hovv he by the *vvord*, vvil *examin al Councels*: And so, the Councels hauing first conferred their definitions vvith scriptur, and finding them in their opinion consonant, he vvil make an examination of al Councels examination, and vvil pronounce sentence on their sentence. So that if the Pope for refusing to haue his doctrine examined, carieth the sign of an heretike, *Luther* and *Caluin*, vvho vvill examin al and vvill not submit their sentence ether to men or angels, are heretikes in the higheſt degree: and they being the Founders of this nevv Church, that also must needes be an heretical synagogue, al being grounded and founded in hereſie. For after *Luthers* and *Caluins* examination, I demaund vvhether they vvil permit their sentence to be examined or not? If no (as in deed they say noe) then are they prouder then the Pope, vvho vvithout any Councel, vvithout proofe of their Mission, by their priuat spirit only, vvil iudge al, and vvil be iudged of none. If they permit their sentence to be examined, then this examination also of their sentence must be examined, and so vve shal euer seeke, & yet be euer to seek. Vvherfore some sentence must be infallible, else vve shal haue noe end in controuersies, noe assuraunce in faith, no repose in conscience. l. 4. Inst. c. 9. §. 12.

4. Novv as concerning Catholikes, none more

obedient and ſubmiſſiue in matters of faith, then they. vvho Knovvving that faith is aboue reasons reach, do not measural by their ovvn Iudgement and priuat ſpirit, as the reformers do, (vvho receaue vvhat Scriptur or vvhat meaning of Scriptur they pleaſe, and reiect the *Real preſence* &. other verities bicauſe they ſeeme to them abſurd) but receaue al humbly, vvhich the Church and her Generall Councels haue decreed, vvithout al examination, captiuating their vnderſtanding in obedience to the Church. Vvheras, *Calvin*, and the reformers arrogate ſo much to their ovvn iudgement, that they vvill examin Generall Councels, and Popes decrees, and although they ſay they vvill examin thé by the *vvord of God*, yet indeed they examin them by their priuat ſpirit, bicauſe by that they iudge vvhether *Councels* haue defined conſonantly to Scriptur: and ſo *Calvin*, but one preferreth his Iudgement before the Iudgement of General Councels, and vvil not haue his ſentence to bee reuerſed by theirs: vvhich, as it is the greateſt arrogancie in the vvorld, ſo is it no leſſe madnes.

l. 4. Inſt. c. 9. §. 12.

Kellison.

# THE TITLE OF THE THIRD BOOKE.

*The third booke conteineth a Survey of their doctrin concerning Christ, in which by many points of their doctrin, it is proued that they are Antichristians, rather then Christians.*

## The Somme of the first chapter.

VERY, *one speaking honourably of him whose doctrin he followeth, as the Stoickes commended* Zeno, *the Platonists* Plato, *the Peripatetickes* Aristotle, *the Epicureans* Epicure, *the Atheists* Diagoras: *If the Reformers be sincere Christians they will speake and teach honourably of Christe, whose doctrine they professe to follow: But they rather pluck sacrilegious hands vpon his honourablest Title, which is* God, *and the* Sonne of

Luth. tom. Latom. Lut. in c. 1. Gen. to. 6. folio 4. Vvitt. 1561 2. Io. 5. l. de conc. p. 2. pag. 276. Cōfess de Cœna. Mel. loc. com f. 43. Imp. 1545. Lut. in 56. cord. Cal. ep. ad Pol. Cal. l. cōt. Valent. refut. 10. & in c. 14. Gen. num. 1 Calvinus Iudaizãs.

God: *as to omit* Setuetus *and the new* Arrias, Luther *doth professedly* [illegible] *calling Christ the* instrument of God, *in blotting out of the Germain Letanies* Sancta Trinitas vnus Deus miserere nobis: *in cutting of from those vvordes of Esay* c. 9. Deus fortis, Deus: *in omitting in S.* Ihons *Epistle*, Tres sunt qui testimoniũ dant in cælo &c. *and in avouching Christes diuinitie to suffer: as Melanchthon also and others do, vvho say Christ vvas preist, prayed, and vvas obedient according to his diuinitie: and as* Caluin *doth, vvho saith, God the Father is God by excellence, and that God the Sonne is not God of God, but ministrer, and vvho expoundeth al places of scriptur, vvhich the Fathers allege to proue Christ God, in fauour of the Ievves: ergo these men are no Christians, but Antichristians.*

## *Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

1. TO make shorter vvorke, our Hastie Minister, after his cauilling at my *exordium*, in vvhich he saith I compare *Diagoras* vvith Christe, he denieth al this vvher vvith I haue charged them, saying that he endeuoureth to make a fauorable glosse vppon some of *Luthers* and *Caluins* hard speeches. But let the Proctor speake and plead this his freindes

freindes cause, in his owne, not in my words: and first let vs hear, what he saith for *Servetus*.

SOTCLIFF.

*Whatsoeuer Servetus blasphemies were, he learned them* (saith Sotc.) *among Papists where he was brought vp, not among vs where he was punished for his blasphemies.* Sotc. chap. 3. pag. 43.

KELLISON.

1. AMong vs Sir Minister? why then stayed he not in Spain, where he was borne, to countenaunce his doctrin by the Inquisition? Indeed I graunt, that as *Luther*, and *Caluin* and al Archeretiques were brought vp amongest vs, so was *Servetus*, and no otherwise. For as they were once Catholikes who receued their Christendome among vs, and therfore were heretikes in leauing vs, as aboue is declared, so was *Servetus*. But he, being of an hoat and ambitious spirit, was desirous to purchase a name, as he saw *Luther* and others had done, and therfore leauing Spain, where he found th'Inquisition to hoat for heretikes and blasphemers, he made a voyage into Affrick, and hauing learned the *Alcoran*, framed out of it a God subsisting only in one person, Ee Tert. l. prescr. c. 7. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Cip. ep. ad Ant. fol. 89.

Pratcol. v. Servetani. Lind in dubit. dial. 2. Bel to. 1. l. 1. de Christo. c. 1. Sand. her. 217. Calu. in Actis Servetti.

and by conference vvith Lutherans, yea *Farel and Calum*, vvhose *Collega* and companion, as D. *Sanders* and *Pratcolus* say, he vvas: hee came to that perfection at length, as to bee the Head of *Georgius Blandrata*, *Paulus Alciatus*, *Franciscus David*, and al the *Trinitarian Arrianes*. So that he learned not his blasphemies among vs, but among *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*, yea *Calvinists* also: though proceeding to farre, that is so farre, as to deny the *Trinitie*, and to hold independently of *Calum*, and to cal him selfe the *only prophet of the vvorld*, by *Calums* instigation, he vvas burnt at *Geneua*. This blasphemous fellovv sayd that there vvas but one person in God, and that the Sonne Christe Iesus, vvas not before th' Incarnation, and therfore vvas not consubstantial to God, nor true God, but yet might be called God by participation, bicause God dvvelled in him by grace: as *Nestorius* sayd. Vvherfor our *Sotc.* is a very ignoraunt Minister, in saying that I *do ignorauntly attribute the heresie of Arrius to Servetus, vvhereas he did vvholly deny the Trinitie*: For as *Arius* sayd, that the Sonne vvas a creatur & not consubstantial to his Father, and called God only as Iudges and saints are, so sayd *Servetus*, though he also denyed in expresse

Servet. l. 5. Trin. pag. 189. & Resp. ad art. 1. Calvin. in actis.

Servet his hæresie.

li. 1. cont. Trin. fol. 7. 58. li 3. pag. 92.

termes the Trinitie of persons in one Godhead, and contemptibly and most blasphemously called the sacred Trinitie a three headed *Cerberus*. And although *Calvin* caused him to be burned for this abominable heresie, reserving notwithstanding as *Castalion* saith his golden chayne: yet hee might haue proued it out of *Calvins* wordes. Ex Resc̃io pag. 56.

2. For *Calvin* saith that *the Sonne of God by reason of his office, euen according to the deitie, is lesse then God the Father.* Again he reprehendeth as *an improper and barbarous speech: Holy Trinitie one God*: which was to giue *Seruetus* scope enough to deny Christ to be God, and to giue a fling at the whole Trinitie. Another blasphemous heretike also, *Valentinus Gentilis*, an Italian, moued by the fame of *Calvin*, and desirous also of a name, went to *Geneua*, where hauing conference with *Calvin*, and perceiuing that he builded his heresie on his own priuat spirit, and expounded Scripturs as he pleased to draw them to his byas, thought he might do the like, and so deuised heresies against the Trinitie, and feared not to affirm, that as in God ther are three persons, so there are 3. Spirits differing in essence, al three æternal, but not æqual: bicause (sayd he) God the father is only *es-* Cal. ep. ad frat. Pol. apud Feuard. Entremangeries. pag. 113. 1 ad Valer. Gent. ep. 1. ad Polo. Entremanger. pag. 114. Valer. Gentil Prothes 10. 13 & 1. Antidot. Antid. 3. fol. 26. a. apud Bel. to 1 li. 1. de Christ. c. 2.

sentiator the others essentiati: which his opinion implyed 3. Gods. And although Caluin wrote against him, yet he might haue groũded his heresie on Caluins doctrin. For Caluin in the Actes of Seruetus, eftsones repeateth that God the Sonne hath *a substaunce distinct from the Father*, and seing that by his substaunce he is God, it followeth that he is a distinct God. And writing against Valentinus, to proue that the *Father* communicated not his *essence* to the *Sonne*, he vseth this argumẽt: ether he communicated al or part, if al, then, him selfe wanteth the diuin essence, if part, then the diuine essence was torne and parted: so that it seemeth, Caluin would haue God the Sonne to haue another essence, and so to bee another God. *Beza* saith *the diuine essence is distinct really into* 3. *persons*: but if it bee distinct really into 3. persons, then as there are 3. persons, so there are three Essences, and cõsequently 3. Goddes, as *Valentinus* sayd. And although Caluin and *Beza* in other places do acknowledge 3. persons and one God, and al 3. persons coæqual and consubstantial, yet in speaking other tymes, as we haue seen they do, they might giue occasiõ to the new *Arrians*, *Seruetians*, and *Valentinians*. Wherfore the new

Cal. in act. Serv. pag. 249. 250. 871. 872.

Cal in ex plic. perfid. Valẽt. pag. 916. 917.

Beza in magnatũ fest. fid. Gal.

Arian *George Blandrata* in the Albane disputation, alleaged *Caluins* refutation of the ancient Fathers exposition of that place *the Father and I are one*, and his dislike of these wordes of the Nicen Councel, *God of God*.

3. As concerning *Luther* vvhom I accused to haue sayd, that he hated the vvord *ὁμοούσιον consubstantial*, *Sotc*: saith *it is a matter false and slanderous, his vvordes being cõditional*. I graunt they are conditional, but yet so, as they imply a contempt and hatred of that vvord: for as if one should say, *if I cal Sotcliff a rayling minister, I shal not ly*, hee should in effect cal him soe: so *Luther* saying, *If I hate the vvord ὁμοούσιον and vvould not vse it, I shal not be an heretike (for vvho shal compel mee, so I hold the thing defined in the Councel by Scriptures)* misprizeth in effect that word. But *Sotcl*: should haue added the vvordes following: *And if the Arrians thought euilly of faith, yet this they vvil exacted, vvhether of a good or an euil mynd, that a newv and prophane vvord should not be decreed*. Vvhere vvee see that *Luther* fauoureth the *Arrians* against the Coupeel of Nice, and refuseth the vvord ὁμοούσιον vvith them: for the *Arrians* vvere content to say that *God the Sonne is of his Father, of his substaunce, is his image, is like vnto him*, bicause the- Luther. li. cõtra. Reuelationis. Latom. to. 2. Vvit. 1551. fol. 440. pag. 1.

Ex Athan. ep. decret. Cõc. Nic. & Calu. l. 2 last c. 13 § 4.

se vvordes might in some sort be verified of man a creatur, but the *Councel* (saith *Athanasius* and *Calum* also) decreed that God the Sonne, should be called *ὁμοούσιον*, *consubstantial*, bicause that vvord implyed necessarily, that God the Sonne vvas God as his Father, and coequal and consubstantial to him. This vvord, the Fathers of that Councel liked, *S. Ambrose*, and *Marius Victorinus*, and al Catholikes haue euer approued it, only the Arrians called it *exoticum*, *straunge*, *Luther* calleth it, *newv and prophane*. *Sot*: should haue also added *Luthers* other vvords vvhich goe before the vvordes alleaged: *ὁμοούσιον vvas not receued of many and those most excellent men, vvhich S. Hierom also vvished to be abolished: and complained that he knevv not vvhat venom lurked vnder the syllables and letters.* Vvhich is a double lye of *Luthers* making. one lye it is, that *many most excellent men* receued not *ὁμοούσιον*. True it is, that the vnlavvful Councels of *Ariminum* and *Sirmium*, disliked this word, bicause they fauoured Arrianism, yea the Councel of *Antioch*, vvhich vvas assembled against *Paulus Samosatenus*, refused it, but that vvas before there vvas any controuersie about it vvith th'Arrians, and they refused it only in that sense as *Paulus Samosatenus* vsed it,

Ambr. l. 3. de fid. ad Grat. c. vlt. Mar. Vict. l. 2. cont. Arr. in fin.

Luth. sup.

Ex Ath. ep. de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc

Ex Hil. de synod.

vvho by it vvould proue the Father and Sonne to bee tvvoe Substaunces. *Constantine* also, vvould not haue had the Catholique Bishops to contend vvith th' *Arrians* about this vvord, bicause he desired peace, and thought that othervvise aggreement in faith might be made. But the Nicen Fathers admitted it, and by it conuinced the *Arrians*, bicause the word imported the sonne to be distinct in person, bicause the same person is not ὁμοούσιος *consubstantial* to it selfe but ταυτοούσιος, and it argued him to be of the same substaunce vvith him, and so God as hee: and after the Councels definition al the Fathers imbraced it. Only 5. *Arrianes*, vvhom *Socrate* nameth, refused to subscribe to the *Councel*, by reason of ὁμοούσιος, al Catholique Bishops receued it, and once, euen the *Arrians*, though not sincerly, subscribed vnto it, as appeareth by their *Subscriptions*. Yea, if we beleeue *Gregorius* Priest of *Neo*-Cæsarea and *Nicephorus*, tvvoe of the Catholike Bishops, who dyed before the end of the Coūcel, subscribed vnto it after their death. Another ly is, and that very grosse, that *S. Hierom vvished this vvord to be abolished*: for S. *Hierom* only feared to vse the vvord *hypostasis*, bicause the *Arrians* vnderstanding by it sub-

Ep ad Alexand. & Arrium.

Atha sup. Basil. ep. ad Sabellias Dei. Epiph in Anchor. Ambr. l. 3. de fid c. 7. Hil li de Synod. Hiero. ep. ad Dam. Socr l. 1. c. 8. Baron. to. 3 ann. Christ. 325 pag. 199. Nicerph. l. 8. c. 21. Lippom to 6. orat. de Syn. Nicē.

staunce, vnder that vvord, brought in 3. substaunces in the Trinitie. So farre *S. Hierom* vvas from disliking ὁμοούσιος, that he beseecheth Pope *Damasus* for the loue of the ὁμοούσιον *Trinitie, to giue him authoritie* ether to say or not to say, *hypostases*. But *Sotcliff* should haue marked that in excusing *Luther*, he accuseth his Maister *Caluin*, vvho admitteth the vvord ὁμοούσιος, and graunteth that the Nicen Fathers did very prudently deuise and decree it against the *Arrians*. Hier. ep. ad Dam.

These are his vvordes: *Hic efferbuit impietas dum nomen ὁμοούσιον pessimè odisse & execrari Arriani cœperunt: here impietie vvaxed hoat, vvhileſt the Arrians began most badly to hate and deteſt the vvord ὁμοούσιον.* Again: *vvho dares deteſt thoſe good Fathers as bravvlers about vvordes, bicauſe, for one litle vvord, they vvaxed hoat vvith ſuch a fervour of diſputing? Luther* dareth, and *Sotcliffe* dareth excuſe him. But *Caluin* accuſeth them both, bicauſe, ſayth he, *that vvord did diſtinguiſh betvvixt the true Christians of pure faith, and the ſacrilegious Arrians.* Col. 1. Inſtitut. c. 13 §. 4.

4. Vvheras I ſayd that *diuers affirm, that Luther in his commentaries on Geneſis (vvhich I haue not ſeen) calleth the Sonne of God th'Inſtrument of God the Father: Sotcliff* ſayth, *that like an honeſt ſurueyer, he confeſſeth that he hath not*

*seen those commentaries, and perhaps he would not see them: for if he had, he might haue seen him selfe, cõuinced to be a lying cõpanion.* Good worder, Maister Minister: I had not then seen them in deed: and if I had, as since I haue, I might haue seen, which now I see, that you are a bold fellow: and this you can not but see your selfe (though perchaunce you will not confesse it) if you please to take a veyve of Luthers sixt tome. For there you shal fynd that *Luther* explicating the first chapter of *Genesis*, and declaring how God created al thinges of nothing, addeth these wordes: *Instrumentum autem seu medium quo Deus vsus est, est eius omnipotens verbum: but the Instrument or mean which God vsed, is his omnipotent word.* Behold Sir Sotc: how *Luther* calleth the *omnipotent word of God, his Instrument*, and be ashamed to be so vsual an instrument of the deuil in lying: for although he cal the diuine word, omnipotent also, yet he maketh God the Father omnipotent principally, the Sonne only instrumentally, and seing that th'Instrument is inferiour to the principal Agent, *Luther* makes Christ inferiour to his Father.

Luth. to. 6 fol. 4. pag. 2. impr. ell. Vvitemb. 1561. Calles the word, Instrumẽt.

5. I charged *Luther* also with leauing out these wordes of the *Letanies*: *Sancta Trinitas*

vnus Deus, &c. *Holy Trinitie one God haue mercie on vs*: and that where the Prophet *Esaie* Isay. 9. calleth Christe by the names *Admirable, Counseller, God, strong*, &c. he leaueth out *God*: yea 1. Io. 5. that he left out of *S. Thon* these wordes: *There are three which giue witnesse in heauen, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghost, and these three are one.* Sotcliff answereth that *the reason why he left out the wordes, Holy Trinitie*, &c. *was because the German word, dreifaltigheit, did signifie rather Triplicitie then Trinitie.* Sotcliff then graunteth that *Luther* left out of the Letanies, *Holy Trinitie*, &c. and so, I take that of him: and will proue that *Luther* did not this for *Sotcliffes* reason, but for dislike of the word *Trinitie*. In his sermon on *Trinitie sonday* he saith that, *vocula hæc Trinitas*, &c. *this litle word Trinitie* is not in scriptur but only is inuented by men, it *soundeth coldly, and it were better, if God were called God rather then Trinitie.* *Calum* subscribeth to *Luther*: saying that this word *Trinitie* sauoureth of barbarism. Now whereas *Sotcl.* saith, *it is not like that Luther left out the other wordes*, I must tel him that ether it is like that he hath not seen *Luthers* German Translations and Bibles, or if he haue seen them, he is stil like him selfe, that is hardie, bold and impudent. For

Calu. ep. 1. ad Polon.

in the German Bibles he findeth not those vvordes, as *Possevin* hath vvel obserued, and the bibles extant do beare vvitnes. By this vve see vvhat scope *Luther* and *Caluin* haue giuen to the nevv *Arrians*, vvhoe do thus dispise the vvordes *Consubstantial* and *Trinitie*, vvhich vvere inuented by the Councel and deduced out of Scripture against the *Arrians*: and vvho also haue left out these vvordes of S. *Ihon: ther are three vvhich giue testimonie*, &c. vvhich S. *Athanasius* and S. *Ciprian* and *Fulgentius* vrged against the Arriās as an authentical text and pregnaunt place. Possev. l. de Atheismis heter. c. 2. Ath. l. 1. de vnit. deit. Cipr. l de vnit. Eccl. Fulg. Resp ad Arrian.

6. As touching my accusation of *Luther* that he should say vvith *Eutiches*, that the diuinitie suffred: Sotcliff answereth that *Luthers vvordes, and Bellarmines præface in his dispute De Christo, do refute this sclander*. But both their vvordes shal proue the accusation iust, not sclanderous. Looke then again Sir Minister, vppon the second part of *Luthers* booke of Councels, vvhich I cited, and turn to the 276. page, and tel me vvhether *Luther* calles not the *Zuinglians*, *Nestorians*, bicause they defēded against him that the diuinitie could not suffer. Read also, at your best leisure, *Luthers Confession of the Supper of the Lord*, and tel me vvhether he hath not there these Luth. l. de conc. p. 2. pag. 276. Luther. in c. 6 de

vvordes: *Si ego humanam tantum naturam pro me passam credo, Christus ille simplex vel infirmus mihi salvator est, tum ipse bene indiget alio salvatore: If I beleeue that the humain nature only suffred for me, Christ is a simple or an infirme Sauiour, and then he him selfe needeth another sauiour.* Out of vvhich opinion *Zuinglius* very vvel inferreth, *If Christ according to his deitie is passible, certes he is no God.* of *Luther*, as it is like, one *Gerlachius* learned these blasphemous speeches: *Diuinitas est nata, est crucifica, est mortua, the diuinitie is borne, is crucified, is dead.* I say blasphemous speeches, bicause though it be truly sayd, God vvas born of a virgin, God vvas crucified, God dyed, bicause as man he vvas born crucified, and dyed, and what aggreeth to the humain natur, may be attributed to God *in concreto*, by reason of hypostatical vnion, vvhich is the ground of communication of Idioms: yet to say the diuinitie vvas born of a Virgin, suffried or dyed, is *Eutichianism*, and argueth that the diuinitie suffred and consequently vvas no true diuinitie. As for *Bellarmin* he is so farr from excusing *Luther* herin, that he expressely accuseth him of *Eutichianism*, and auerreth that he fauoureth *Nestorius* and *Eutiches*, and layeth al the fault on S. *Leo* and *Cirillus*. So vve see that my as-

Zuin. resp. ad confess. Luth.

Gerl. cont. Buseum.

Bell. praef. cont. de Christ. to. 1.

cribing the former vvordes to *Luther*, is noe slander in me, but argueth a blasphemie in *Luther* that sayd them, a lye in *Sotc*: that denyeth he sayd them, and a truth in me, vvho affirmed that he sayd them. Hence I inferred that *Luther* maketh Christ no God, because a true God is not vvithout true diuinitie, and true diuinitie, can not be that, which suffreth: and to this I expect an answer.

7. I imputed to *Melanchthon*, *Beza*, and *Caluin* and others, that they say *Christ* prayed, obeyed, and vvas *Priest* and *mediator*, according to his diuinitie. *Sotcliff* answereth that *Melanchthon* hath not these *vvordes*, *according to his diuinitie*: and I graunt it also if he mean the Inglish vvordes, but if he mean that he haue not the sense of these vvordes in Latin, he speaketh according to his vvonted boldnes as vvee shal see. Vvherfore not daring to stand to this, he hath another shift in store. *Suppose* (saith hee) *that he should speake improperly* (blasphemies vvith him are but improper speeches) *should he not haue leaue to interpret him selfe?* Yes Sir, and good reason he should: but he vvould neuer take this leaue, though he vvere vrged by *Stancarus* and others, but obstinatly persisted in that manner of speech. Vvherfore *Sotcliff* leaueth this

answer also: *suppose* (saith he) *they were an errour in his wordes, must we satisfie for his faulte?* noe Sir, vnlesse you imitate or defend his fault: but this his speeche can not, at least, but much derogate to your Church, he being so great a pillar of the same, and a member of your Church, as aboue you haue confessed. But let him and his fellowes by mee charged, speake in their owne words, that I may be discharged. *Melanchthon*, in his common places makes Christ to pray to his Father in this manner: *Nunc missus sum subiectus cruci & seruo meæ vocationi: dande vero gloriam (ô Pater) mihi restitue, quam ante mundi constitutionem apud te habui: Now I am sent as subiect to the crosse, and I serue my vocation: But hencefoorth (ô Father) restore vnto mee the glorie which before the constitution of the world I had with thee.* this glorie, which *Melanchthon* maketh Christ to pray for, can not bee the glorie of his body or soule, because that glorie he had not before the creation of the world but long after: but it must needes bee the glorie of his diuinitie, which only he had before the worlds creation with his father: and therfore *Melanchthon* who makes him to pray for the restoring of this glorie, seemeth to be of opinion, that Christ by Incarnation lost this

aboue fol 151. pag. 1.

Melia locis edit. an. 1545. fol. 45.

glorie, and so in diuinitie vvas inferiour to his father. And again saith hee: *Non est quidem lacerata aut mortua diuina natura: sed fuit obediens Patri, quiuit, cessit iræ diuinæ: The diuine natur vvas not rent nor dead, but it vvas obedient to the father, it yeelded to the diuine anger.* Here vve see the vvordes denyed by *Sotc.* to vvit, that Christ vvas obedient, *according to his diuine natur.* The *Lutherans* in their *Concord*, affirm that Christ vvas obedient according to both natures, that is, diuinitie, and humanitie. *Caluin*, as is to bee seen, in *Caluino-Turcismo*, in his letters to the *Polonians*, affirmeth that Christ according to his diuine person euē from the beginning and before Adams fal, vvas a mediatour. He addeth, that vvhen Christ desired of his father, *to be glorified vvith that glorie vvhich he had from the beginning before the constitutiō of the vvorld, it should bee a præposterous desire, if it vvere vnderstood only of the humain nature.* So sayd Arrius. Again saith he, *It is not absurd to confesse Christe to be less then the Father, if according to the diuinitie he make intercessiō to him: because Christ him selfe, as often as he susteineth the person of a mediatour, doubteth not to subiect him selfe to the Father.* And yet again: *although* (saith he) *by the ancient fathers that sentence of Christ, pater*

Mel. in lo. co. edit. an 1545.

Luth. in concord.

Caluino-turc. l. 3. c. 8

Io. 17.

Ad tract. pag. 991.

ex Basil. l. 4. cōt. Eunom. Aug. tract. 105. Cir. l. 10. Thesaur. c. 1. & 9. Trac. pag. 944.

maior meeſt, the father is greater then I, vvas reſtrained to his humain natur, yet I doubt not to extend it to both. But moſt playn are theſe his
pag. 940. wordes, *Certè impius eſt, quiſquis negat Chriſtum diuinitatis reſpectu mediatorem eſſe, Certes he is vvicked, vvhoſoeuer denyeth Chriſte to bee a mediatour in reſpect of his diuinitie.* To him ſubſcribeth
Beza ep. 28. *Beza, quis enim negauerit, &c. for vvho vvil deny that this obedience* (of Chriſte) *began from the Incarnation, and is to be referred both to the vvholle compound perſon, that is, to both natures iointly conſidered, and to appertain to the humain and diuine natur, diſtinctly conſidered.* And bicauſe he ſavv that thus he ſeemed to make the diuinitie of Chriſte inferiour to the Father, he ſayth in the next vvordes, that an æqual may obey his æqual. Out of theſe ſpeeches followeth of neceſſitie this blaſphemie, to vvit, that Chriſte according to his diuinitie was inferiour to his Father, and conſequently nether conſubſtantial nor æqual to him, nor one God vvith him. For ſeing that obedience can not be yeelded but to a Superiour (for though a mã may do a thing which his fellovv or freind deſireth him, yet as his fellovv can not commaund, ſo he can not properly be obeyed) if Chriſt as God and in reſpect of his diuinitie vvas obedient,

he

he vvas inferiour, if inferiour, not true God, bicause God must needs be consubstantial, equal and coæqual to God, and so not inferiour.

8. I charged also the *vbiquitaries*, vvith this opinion, to vvit, that the diuine attributes are really communicated vnto Christes humain natur. But *Sorcliff* of his vvonted charitie, affordeth them a fauourable interpretation saying, that they meane only that the diuine attributes are communicated to the humain nature by cõmunication of Idioms, but yet he vvill iniurie Papists to fauour Lutheranes, saying, that *this toucheth Papists, who put Christs body in diuers places, and consequently must put it also in the middst: yea*, saith he, *this their errour proceedeth from the Real presence*. Thus he, but othervvise vvee. for Catholikes affirme, that although the personal vniõ of Christs humain natur, vvith the diuine person, be the cause, vvhy vve may trulie say (*in concreto*) God is man, God vvas borne of the *Virgin Marie*, God suffred and dyed: and contrarie wise may as truly say, man is God, the man Christe created the world, the man Christe vvas before *Abraham*, is omnipotẽt, immense, &c. bicause these thinges are truly sayd of the same person in respect of his Th. 3. p. q. 2. a. 7. ad 3.

two natures: yet to say that the diuinitie is the humanitie, that the diuinitie was born of the *Virgin Marie*, that the diuinitie suffred or dyed, is a blasphemie, which destroyeth the diuinitie: and to say, that the humanitie is the diuinitie, or that the humanitie created, the world, or was before *Abraham*, or is omnipotent, or immense, is to cõfound the humain nature, with the diuine nature, and to turn it into diuinitie, & consequently, this were to ruinate Christes humain nature, and so to make him no true man. And yet this the Lutheran *vbiquetaries*, sayd, yea *Luther* him selfe, as their wordes will witnes. Let *Luther* speake then in his owvn wordes. In his booke of Councels and second part he hath these wordes, *Hæc caro & sanguis condidit cælum & terram: this flesh and bloud created heauen and earth.* Where wee see how he giueth omnipotencie, and the power of creating proper to the diuinitie, vnto Christs Flesh and blood. he giueth also y^e^ attribute of immẽsitie vnto Christes body and humain natur. *Credimus* (saith he) *quod Christus Iesus sit iuxta humanitatem super omnes cælos collocatus & omnia impleat &c.* *We beleeue that Christ Iesus according to his humanitie is placed aboue al the heauens, and filleth al,*

Luth. l. de conc. p. 1.

Luth l de sacr cœnæ apud Possevin de Atheis.

*as Paule writeth to the Ephesians*, & that Christ is Lord of al not only according to his diuinitie, but also according to his humanitie. and again he saith, that Christ as man, *is in al creatures, in a stone, in vvater, in fier.* This he esie he proueth by this argumēt. where God is, there is the flesh of Christ, but God is euery where, *ergo* Christe as mā is euery where. And in his *greater confession*, he proueth it by this reason, bicause saith he, vvhere socuer Chiste is, he is vvholly, his tvvoe natures being inseparable. The same is the opinion of *Brentius*, who auoucheth that the humain natur, *is exalted to diuine maiestie*, and that *it vvas in heauen inuisibly before the Ascension, and is nowv also there, and euery vvhere.* By this vve see a manifest difference in speech betvvixt *Catholiques* and *Lutherans*. Bicause Catholiques though they graunt, that by *communication of Idioms*, it may bee truly sayd, that the man Christe is eternal, omnipotent, immense, bicause the man Christe is God, is so, yet they deny that Christe as man, is eternal, omnipotent, or immense, and consequently they hold it for a blasphemie to say, that the humanitie of Christe is eternal, omnipotent or immense, bicause to say so, destroyeth Christes humain nature, and turnes into di-

Luth. in c. 9. Eccl. in Confess. maiori.

Brent. l. de om. 1519 sen. l. de duabus naturis.

Difference betvvixt Cath. and Luther.

uinitie and deitie. As for example, pointing to Sugre, vvee may say: this vvhite thing is svveete, and this svveete thing is vvhite, but yet wee cã not truly say, this thing as sweete, is vvhite, or this thing as vvhite is sweet, nether can vve say truly, this vvhitenes is svveetnes, or this vvhitenes is svveet. Euen so Catholikes say, the man Christe is God, æternal, omnipotent, immense, but they say not that he is so, as man; nether that the humanitie is diuinitie, or is immense, æternal, or omnipotent. Yet *Luther* and *Brentius*, say so, as vve haue seen. And therfore, as to say, that vvhitenes in Sugre is Svveetnes, or is sweet, is to destroye the nature of whitenes, and to confound it vvith Svveetnes: so to affirm that Christes humanitie is his diuinitie, or that it is æternal, immense, or omnipotent, is to destroy the humain natur, and to confound it vvith the diuinitie, and so in effect also, it is to destroy the diuinitie, making the humanitie æqual vnto it, and so is to make Christe, nether true God, nor true man. As for *Luthers* argument, it is nothing vvorth. For although the humain natur be iointly vnited to the diuinitie in Christe, yet the diuinitie being more ample then the humanitie, may be where the humanitie is not.

Lut. argument answered.

For although when twoe vnæqual thinges be vnited, where the lesser is, there the larger & greater is, yet is not y^e lesser in euery place vvhere the larger is. as for example: the soule is vnited wholly to the finger, and so vvhere the finger is there is the soule, but not where the soule is there is the finger, bicause so the finger should be in the head, vvhere also the soule is. And although God vvho is euerie vvhere, bee man, yet is he not man as he is in euery place, but only as hee is in heauen, and in the blessed Sacrament, bicause since his Ascension, his humain natur, is not out of these places, at least ordinarilie.

9. Vvheras *Sotcliff* affirmeth that this monstrous opinio of the *vbiquetaries*, proceedeth from the real presence, vvhich Catholikes hold, he argueth him selfe not to knovv vvhat he affirmeth. For vvee differ in groundes and opinions from the *vbiquetaries*: for they affirm Christes humanitie to bee euery vvhere and omnipotēt, and æternal, bicause it is vnited to the diuine person, vvhich is euery where, and hath the diuine attributes really cōmunicated, vvhich groundes vvee deny. For although in the virgins vvomb, Christes humanitie was vnited to the diuine person, yet vve say, that it vvas not then out

of the wombe, much lesse was it euery where, although then, that blessed babe Christe, might bee called æternal, because as God he was so, yet we graunt that as man hee was yonger then his mother, and that his humanitie was not æternal. Wherfore that wee put Christes body in heauen and earth and in diuers Altars at one tyme, it is not for these groundes, but for Christes wordes
Mat. 26. *this is my body*, that wee say soe. For if Christe truly and properly called that which he had in his handes at his last Supper *his body*, it must needes follow, that his body is in as many places as the breades are that are turned into his body, because as the water being
Io. 2. turned into wine at the mariage, the wine succeeded in place of the water, so the bread being turned by *Transubstantiation*, into Christes body, that must succeed in al places, where the bread was before consecration. And so out of this opinion it followeth not, that Christes body is euery where, but only where the consecrated hostes are, neither is *Sorcliffes* argument worth a rush. For as the soule is in diuers places, so is Christes body, and as if God did miraculously conserue the dispositiõs in the arme cut of, and supply the influence frõ the harte, the soule should bee

in diuers separated places & not in the middest, so may Christes body bee. bicause as diuersitie of places maketh noe diuersitie of soules, so nether doth it of bodies, the vnitie of the soule and bodie, being distinct from the vnitie of the place: and so one body reteining his intrinsecal vnitie, may bee in diuers places, and yet nether in the middst, nor alplaces. And bicause vvee put not Christs body euery vvhere, as the *vbiquetaries* doe, the absurdities that followv their opinion haue no connexion vvith ours. For our opinion destroyeth not Christes body and humanitie as that doth: bicause vvee confesse Christes body to bee, in al intrinsecal dimensions, limited and straitned, as other bodies are, though by miracle it bee in diuers places by a certain repetition of the same. Nether do the absurdities vvhich are implied in that opinion, follovve ours. For if Christe as man be euery vvhere, and if his humanitie bee immense, as the *vbiquetaries* say, then could not christ haue been borne bicause, he could not issue out of the *Virgins* vvomb, being vvith in and vvithout already; then had he been no more in the Virgins vvomb, then in al mens and vvomens bellies: then could he not haue vvalked or moued him selfe

Absurdities of the Vbiquetaries.

out of any place, being in al places, bicause by local motion the body is moued to that place, vvhere before it vvas not: and consequently, hee could not haue been lifted vp on the crosse, nor deposed from it: nether could he haue been buried: nether could his soule descend to Hel, being there before; nether could his soule be separated from the body, being euery vvhere vvith the body, and so Christe could not haue dyed: nether could he haue ascended to Heauen, being there before: nether can hee descend to Iudgement, nether can Christians eate his body or drinke his bloud, bicause to eate & drinke is to cõueigh the meate and drinke into the stomake, which can not be, if Christes body bee euery vvhere. for then it is in the stomake before eating. But these adsurdities follovv not our opinion, vvhich holdeth Christe to bee only in some certain places, but not in euery place. For if he be not in al places, he may moue or be moued to the place vvhere he vvas not. Vvherfore *Calum* saith that the Papists opinion is more moderate and tolerable then that of the *Lutheran ubiquetaries*, and calleth them *Seruetians*, vvho turn Christs human nature into diuinitie.

Cala. li. 4. c. 17.

10. I accused *Calum* for teaching that the

name of God is attributed to the Father ὡς ἐξοχὴν *by excellencie*, and him and Vvhitaker, for denying Christe to be *God of God*, and *Caluin*, *Iewvel*, and others for making Christe Priest according to his diuinitie. *Sortliff* answereth that *Caluin* when he sayed that God the Father is God *by excellencie*, hee meaneth not that as God he hath any preeminence, but as he is the first person in Trinitie. But this fauorable glosse standeth not vvith *Caluins* text, as I shal proue. For *Caluin* saith not only that the Father is greater then the sõne according to the diuine person. For that in a good sense is true, & verified by ancient fathers, as *S. Hilarie*, *S. Basil*, *S. Gregorie Nazianzen*, and *Epiphanius*, yea by the Councel of *Sardis*: who affirm the sonne euẽ in person to bee in this sense lesser thẽ the Father, bicause the name Father seemeth to import a dignitie vvhich the sonne hath not, in that it argueth him to be the authour and *principium*: though othervvise the sonne is æqual to his Father, as being consubstantial: for al though hee be begotten of his Father, yet, as *S. Austin* saith, *the Father is not greater then his sonne, bicause he begot an æqual sonne.* But *Caluin* doth not only say that God the father as Father hath the preeminence, but also, as

l. cont. Valent. 1 refut. 10.

Hil. l. 9. 10. de Trinit. Basil. li. 1. cont. Eunom. in fine. Greg. Naz. orat. 35. 36. Epipha. in Author. cõc. Sard. ep. cõfes. Trinit.

Aug. l. cõt. Maximin. c. 14.

Calu. li. cõt. Valet. refut. 10. in cap. 14. Gen. Cal. ibid.

God: for he sayth, *the name God aggreeth to him by excellencie*, yea he addeth that *God the father only and properly is Creatour of heauen and earth*, and that the sonne is subiect to the father euen according to his diuinitie.

11. That *Caluin* condemned the *Nicen* Fathers speech, *God of God*, as hard and impertinent, *Sotc:* could not deny, but he sayth he meant only, that Christe as God, is *autheos*, and not God of God, though as he is the sonne he proceeded from his Father: vvhich is to say, that Christe is sonne of his Father, but not God of God. And thus *Vvhitaker* also explicateth *Caluin*, saying, *vt sit filius id quidem a Patre accepit, vt Deus sit, id ex se habet qua per se Deus est, that he is sonne he hath it of his Father, that he is God, he hath of him selfe, because he is God by him selfe.* And so also *Caluin* him selfe expoundeth him selfe. Vvherfore saith *Vvhitaker vtcumque Patres Nicæni dixerũt, Christum Deum de Deo, tamen firmissimè tenendum est: cõfirmat Caluinus, Christũ ex sese habere vt Deus sit, nisi Christum volumus sua diuinitate spoliare: howsoeuer the Nicen Fathers sayd Christe to be God of God, yet Caluin confirmeth, that it is firmely to be holden, that Christe hath of him selfe that he is God.*

Vvhit. cõt. Campian. pag. 153.

Calu. in expol. per fid. Gent. pag. 417. l. 1. Inst. ca. 13.

12. Here first I not the arrogancie of *Cal-*

um, vvhitaker and Sotcliff, vvho dare condemne a vvholle generall Councel, and the Councel of Nice also, of improper and hard speech: and vvho can think that they themselues vnderstand scripture better, and speake more cõformably vnto it, in saying Christe to be God of him selfe and not God of his father: not with standing that this Creed vvas confirmed by the Councel of Constantinople, by Athanasius, and al the Christian vvorld. The arrogancie of heretes.

13. Secondly here I note the blasphemie vvhich *Caluin* hath couched vnder this his *aseitas* and *God of him selfe*. For first if Christe be God of him selfe and not God of his father, then hath he not his substaunce and deitie from his father, and so is not his Sonne, bicause in generation, the Father communicateth his nature to his Sonne, & so to say that Christe is not God of God, is to say that hee hath not his deitie and substaunce and nature frõ the Father: vvhich is to make the Father no father, the Sõne no sonne, and to depriue them both of the honourable titles of Father and sonne. Secondly this is to make Christe noe Image of God the Father, contrarie to that of th' Apostle, *qui est imago Dei invisibilis*, *vvho is the* Coloss. 1. their blasphemie. The make Christe no Sonne of God.

They make him no Image of God.

*Image of the inuisible God.* For as although the sonnes of Iacob were of the same nature (*in specie*) with *Esau*, yet they were not his images, but only the images of *Iacob*, because he begot them, and expressed him selfe in them: so if Christe bee not God of God nether hath his Godhead from the Father, he is not the Fathers image, because he hath not his essence from him, by which only he representeth the Father; for although painted or grauen images, proceed not *effectiue*, but only *obiectiue* from them whose images they are, but rather from the painter or caruer: yet liuely Images, such as Sonnes are, should not be images of their Fathers, if they receued not their natures from them, by which their parentes haue expressed, and as it were drawn, and portraited their likenes in them.

They make him not Consubstantial.

14. Thirdly thus *Caluin* fauoureth the *Arrians*, in taking away *homoon* and making the Sonne not *consubstantial*. For the Fathers of the *Nicen Councel*, defining the Sonne to be *consubstantial*, vnderstand not only that he hath the same substaunce and natur with him, but also that he hath it by eternal generation communicated vnto him from his Father. But if Christe bee not *God of God*,

nor hath his God head, but only his person or personalitie, from his Father, he is not in this sense *consubstantial*. Now that the Fathers yea and Scriptur also, doe meane this by *consubstantial*, it is manifest by the places of Scriptur which they alleaged. For they alleaged out of *Dauid*, those words of God the Father to the Sonne, *ex vtero ante Luciferum genui te*, *I begat thee of my wombe* (that is of my fertile substaunce and nature) *before Lucifer*: as *Eusebius* him selfe expoundeth it. They alleaged also that of Christe, *as the Father hath life in him selfe, so hath he giuen also to the Sonne to haue life in him selfe*, that is diuinitie, natur, and essence. and yet *Caluin* saith that he hath life of him selfe, and not from his father. To the same effect they alleaged the like words, *my Father that which he hath giuen mee*. Wherfore S. *Athanasius* saith, *this is the true faith, that we beleeue and confesse that our Lord Iesus Christe the Sonne of God, is God and man, he is God of the substaunce of his Father before al worldes*, &c. *Caluin* saith he is God of him selfe. S. *Basil* explicating ὁμοούσιον *consubstantial*, saith that those thinges are ὁμοούσια *consubstantial*, which not only are of the same substaunce or essence, but also when the one proceedeth from the other: *quando*

Psal 109.

Fust l. c. 1 hist Eccl. Io. 5. Ciril. l. 7. Trinit. Ambr. l. 3. de SS. c. 18 Aug. tract. 48. Cirill. l. 7. Luc 10.

Athan. in Symb.

Basil epi. ad ancilar Dei.

causatiuum & id quod cum causatiuo existentiam habet, eiusdem existit naturæ. So that vvhen the Councel of Nice and Fathers, cal the Sonne ὁμοούσιον consubstantial, they mean a cõmunication in substaunce, like to cõsanguinitie. For as the Sõne of a man is sayd to bee kinne and of the same bloud vvith his Father, bicause he hath his bloud and nature from him: so Christ is sayd to bee consubstantial to his Father, bicause he is not only of the same nature vvith him, but bicause he hath receiued his nature also of him. And yet according to Caluin, Vvhitaker, and Sotcliff, there should not bee so much diuine consanguinitie (I vse this vvord for vvante of another) betvvixt God the Father and his Sonne, as is betvvixt the childe and his Father, noe, not so much as is betvvixt children of diuers families, for they al are descended from one common father Adam. So that if God the Father be God of him selfe, if God the Sonne be God of him selfe, if God the holy Ghost be God of him selfe, there is no diuine kindred betvvixt them, and they haue not that diuine consanguinitie and consubstantialitie, vvhich the Councel of Nice and the ancient Fathers meaned.

Vvhat is ὁμοούσιος.

15. Fourthly vvheras Caluin feared to graunt

*Christe God of God*, least he should make him another God: by denying it he incurreth the same daunger, and so falleth into *Sylla*, when he seeketh to auoyd *Charybdis*. For according to *Calum*, God the Father is God of him selfe, God the Sonne is God of him selfe, and hath no diuinitie from his Father, God the holy ghost also is God of him selfe, proceeding as God from nether: and so the diuine persons are nether Kith nor Kinne, but alienes, straungers, and consequently diuers Goddes. Vvhich absurditie notvvithstanding, is easilie auoided, although wee say that Christ is God of God and hath his godhead from his father. For although he receueth his essence from his Father by æternal generation, yet he receueth it necessarilie, it being not in the Fathers free choise to generate, and so not *precario*, as *Calum* vvould infetre: and although he receue his essence from his Father, yet no distinct essence, because the father communicateth the same essence, vvhich him selfe hath: and so nether is he a distinct God, nether doth it hence follovv that the diuine essence generateth, and is generated (vvhich vvould argue a distinct essence) but only that the father generateth the sonne is generated: though, as is proued

They make him another God.

he should not be sayd to generate if he did not cõmunicate his essence, and the sonne should not be sayd to be generated, if he receueth not his essence from him. But this discourse had been fitter for the Schoole & chaire, then for an Inglish booke and might better haue been explicated in Latin, the Inglish, had not *Sotcliff* vrged mee here vnto, and to his owvn disaduantage.

16. I auouched that *Calvin*, *Iewvel*, and others, made *Christe a Preest and Mediatour according to his diuinitie*: Sotcliff answvereth that they meant only, *that the office of Christs Mediatiõ and Priesthod belõged to nether natur singly but to the Person which is God and man*. But nether doth this glosse aggree with their texte. For they say not only that Christe God & mã, is Priest and mediatour, but they say also *that he is prieſt and mediatour as God*. *Calvin* saith plainly, *that he is vvicked vvhosoeuer denyth Christe to be Mediatour in respect of his diuinitie*. *Iuel* against *D. Harding*, saith, *that there vvere 2. natures in Christe, deitie and humanitie, Christe by his humain nature vvas immolated, but by the diuine natur he vvas the Prieſt and offred the Sacrifice*. And then say I, as I had sayd before in my Survey, Christe as God and in respect of his diuinitie is inferiour to his Father, bicause

in Treat. pag. 940. vide Calvino-turcism. l. 1. c. 2. Iuel ar. 17. §. 14

cause the Priest is alvvayes inferiour to him to vvhom he offereth Sacrifice, as is manifest by this, that the Priest offring Sacrifice, acknovvledgeth Supreme Dominion and soueraintie in him to vvhom he offereth, and adoreth him vvith *Latria*. Yea if Christe as God vvas priest, then as God he vvas distinct from his Father, and so a distinct God, because the Priest as Priest, is distinct from him to vvhom he offereth Sacrifice. True it is that Christe Iesus, vvas Priest, yea sacrifice also, and the God to vvhom the sacrifice was offered, but vvhen vvee distinguish hovv he vvas Priest and Sacrifice, vvee must also distinguish the natures. For Christe God and man dyed for vs, and yet vvee may not say that he dyed or suffered according to his diuinitie, nor according to both natures, for that vvere to make not only the humanitie but also the diuinitie to suffer. This I vvill illustrate vvith an example, as familiar to *Sotcliff*, as *Sotcliff* is to him selfe. *Matthevv Sotcliff* is sayd to preach or discourse, bicause *actiones sunt suppositorum*, but not according to his body, no nor according to both the soule and body, bicause so the body should discourse, vvhich yet can not bee, it being deuoyd of reason; but he is sayd to discourse 1. Metaph. c. 1.

according to his soule, which is, or should be, reasonable. Euē so *Christe* God and man, is *Priest* and *Mediatour*, but not according to his diuinitie, as *Caluin* and *Iuel* doe say, for thē the diuinitie should be inferiour, nor according to both natures, as the *Lutheranes* in their *Concord*, and *Beza* in his 28. Epistle affirme, for so not only the humain natur, but also the diuinitie should be inferiour; but only according to his humain natur, which only could stoupe, and humiliate it selfe.

pag. 716. Beza ep. 28.

This S. *Austin* confirmeth in these words:

l. 1. de pec. orig. c. 28. *Non per illud mediator est, per quod æqualis Patri, &c. Not by that, he is mediator, by which he is equal to the Father for by this he differeth from vs, as much as the Father doth, and how shal there bee medietie, or mediation, where is the same distaunce? Therfore the Apostle saith not Christe Ie-*

1. Tim. 2. *sus*, is our mediatour, *but the man Christe Iesus: by this therfore he is Mediatour, by which he is man; inferiour to the Father by that, by which he is nearer to vs, Superiour to vs by that, by which nearer to the Father.* And again he saith, *Christe*

l. 10. ciuit. c. 20. *is a true mediatour in as much as he tooke the forme of a Seruaunt, seing that in the forme of God, he receiueth the Sacrifice with his Father, with whom he is one God.* Which his doctrine is farre differēt, frō this new doctours diuinitie.

17. Nether doth it argue tvvoe persons in Christe, (as *Sotcliff* fondly inferreth) to say he vvas Priest as man, no more then it doth to say Christe suffred as man, only it argueth tvvoe natures in one person of Christe, the one humain by vvhich he vvas the Priest, th'other diuine, by which he was the ood to vvhich the Priest offred. For Christe as man offered the sacrifice of his body and bloud to the vvholle Trinitie, and consequently vnto him selfe as God, and one of the 3. diuine persons. Nether do Catholikes say as *Sotcliff* imposeth, that *the diuine Person of Christe acted nothing*, for vve confesse, that Christe satisfied though nether the diuinitie, nor Christe as God satisfied nor offred sacrifice, for the reasons alleaged, yea wee graunt that though nether Christe as God, nor the diuinitie offered sacrifice, but only Christe as man, yet the diuine person vvas necessarie to dignifie the sacrifice and satisfaction, and so the diuine person in this sense vvas an Acter in our Redemption: for though as man hee offered sacrifice, as he prayed and suffered, yet if he had not been also God, his operations had not been θεάνθρωπα that is operations of God and man, and so Christes sacrifice had been deficient, and his satisfaction

vvanting. And thus much for this matter and to much for *Sotcliffes* purpose: bicause by this it is manifest, vvhat blasphemers *Caluin, Iewel* and others his maisters are, and vvhat an ill aduocate he him selfe is.

18. Finally I alleaged hovv a *Lutheran* called *Ægidius Hunnius*, hath vvritten a booke vvhich he intitleth *Caluinus Iudaizans, Caluin playing the Iew*, bicause in that booke he declareth hovv *Caluin* vvresteth almost al the places of the old and nevv Testament, against the fathers (vvho vnderstood them of Christe) and in fauour of the Iewes. *Sotc.* answereth that *the testimonie of a svvorn enemie is not to be regarded, nor hath any man that felicite in expounding scriptures that he sayleth in nothing.* Behold vvhat a short memorie this minister hath. euen novv, as vvee haue seen aboue in the second booke and sixt chapter, *Caluinists* and *Lutheranes* vvere great freindes and members of one Church, novv they are svvorn enemyes. But seing that *Hunnius* alleageth *Caluins* expositions of many places in particuler, hee must bee beleeued though he bee a sworn enemie, if *Caluin* him selfe be to be credited. As for example, that place of *Deuteronomie*: *Thy Lord God shal rayse vp for thee a Prophet of thy owvn nation, and*

Deut. 18.

thy owne brethern, as thy selfe. This place the fathers, yea S. Peter also, haue interpreted as meant of Christe, Caluin saith it can not be properly so vnderstood. That place of Esaie, *The Spirit of the Lord vppon mee*: The fathers and Christe him selfe expound as meant of Christe, Caluin vnderstandeth it of Esayes vocation. That place of Hieremie, *A woman shal compasse a man*: Christians vnderstand of Christe conceued and compassed by the virgins vvõb; Caluin sayth the Iewes laugh at them for it. That place of Daniel, vvhich maketh mention of *a stone cut from the mountain vvithout handes*, S. Austin and the fathers haue vnderstood of Christe cut from the mountaine, Marie, or the Synagogue of the Ievves, with out handes and help of man: *Nonne lapis iste* (saith S. Austin) *qui præcisus est de monte sine manibus, Christus est de regno Iudæorum sine opere maritali? Is not this stone, vvhich is cut from the mountain vvithout handes, Christe of the Kingdome of the Ievves, vvithout the help of man?* Caluin saith it is absurdly vvrested to signifie the natiuitie of Christe of the *Virgin Marie*. To omit other places, that notable place of S. Ihon, *Ego & Pater vnum sumus, I and the Father are one*, the fathers generally alleged against the *Arrians*

A&. 3. Isa. 61. Luc. 4. Ierem. 31. Dan. 2. Aug. trac. 1. in epist. Ioan. Ibi. to. Basil. in comment. Aug. & Chrys. in c. 10. Io. Bern ser. 71. super Cant.

to proue Christe God and consubstantial to his father, in vvhich meaning the Ievves also tooke Christe, vvhen he sayd so and therefore vvould haue stoned him: yet *Calvin* vpon this place and in his Institutions feareth not to pronounce, *that the ancients abused this place to proue Christe consubstantial, for Christe disputeth not of the vnitie of substaunce but of the consent (of vvill) vvhich he hath with the Father.* So that *Calvin* reiecting al the places which the fathers alleage as good against the Ievves and *Arrians*, he may iustly bee called not only *Calvinus Iudaizans*, but also *Arrianizans*: and I hauing veryfied al vvhervvith I charged *Sotcliffes* maisters, my conclusion followeth, to vvit, that they haue despoiled Christe of his most honourable Titles, God, and the Sonne of God, yea & of man also, and so are noe sincere Christiãs, but rather Antichristians; and, as *Ihon* Schutz a Lutherane sayd, *Mahometisme*, *Arrianism*, and *Calvinism*, *are three Sisters*, *and three hoses of one cloth.*

Calu. in c. 10 Io. & l. 4. Inst c. 14.

l. 10. epist. rum apud Fevard. Enchirid. cap. 9. pag. 88.

## The somme of the 2. chapter.

*MAn vvas once free in Paradise and before sinne, a Slaue after sinne, vvherfore a Ran-*

*sommer and Redeemer vvas necessarie: none sufficient but God and man, none more fit then Christe Iesus, vvho like the meane participating of the extremes, God and man, and being the middle person in Trinitie, vvas fittest to be the mediatour betwixt God and man. This Redeemer payed a great ransom for vs, as is shevved. The Reformers vvho deny inherent Iustice and say that vve haue no other Iustice nor satisfaction then Christs Iustice imputed vnto vs, and consequently teach, that our iustice, vvorkes, and satisfaction, are not necessarie: vvho say Christe hath freed vs from al lavves so that noe lavv novv bindeth vs, and from hel also bicause no sinne can be imputed vnto vs, vvhileſt Christes Iustice is imputed; the Reformers I say make Christ an absurd Redeemer, so to redeem vs as to giue vs occasion to neglect al good vvorkes bicause his vvorkes suffice, and to feare no sinne, bicause it can not be imputed.*

*Sotcliffes answer, vvith the Refutation.*

1. TO this *Sotcliffe* answereth so obscurely and ambiguously, that vve had need to call for an *Oedipus* to riddle his riddle. At the first blush, he seemeth to graunt they are iustified only by Christes Iustice imputed vnto them: for, relating hovv I Sotc. fol. 47.

charge them with this opinion, he saith, *that if this be absurd, it doth not touch them only, but the holy Prophets and Apostles also*, whom he alleageth to proue that we are iustified by Christes owne iustice. Yet by and by after he sayth: *Wee do not deny that ther is a certain imperfect iustice in man sanctified by Gods holy spirit, and that such do good workes pleasing God*, which yet he confesseth *not to be so perfect as to deserue eternal life. Finally* (saith hee) *we know that the fathers sometymes account the obedience of the law to bee a satisfaction.* And yet presently after, hee seemeth to go from this againe, saying: *But did wee attribute al the honour of our Iustification and Saluation vnto Christe our Sauiour* (that is so, as to deny al inherent iustice, for with this I charged them) *yet this is nether absurditie nor dishonour to Christe.* Then answering to the absurdities which I inferred out of this their assertion, which were these: that forsooth noe good workes then were necessarie, no euil workes hurtfull, and no law should bynde; he shewes not how these absurdities follow not, but only denyeth the conclusion, saying, *wee graunt good workes not as iustifying but as the effectes of Iustification, yea wee*, saith he, *hold that sinnes do hurt the sinners*

So that *Sotcliff* seemeth to graunt an inhærent iustice though imperfect, and a necessitie of good vvorkes. But vvhen he sayth, *vve do not deny but that there is a certain imperfect iustice in man, vvee knovv that the fathers acknovvledge satisfaction, vvee affirme gods lavv to bynde, vvee beleeue that all sinnes do hurt those that do them*: I knovv not vvhom he vnderstandeth by his (*vvee*) vnlesse he haue pigges in his belly, bicause the cheefe *Lutherans* and *Caluinists*, do teach as I had charged them, and so doth *Sotcliff* in effect hold, as vve shal see, and therfore the absurdities by mee inferred out of this their doctrine, must be answvered.

2. Concerning our Iustification, *Osiander* vvas of opinion that vvee are iust only by Gods essential Iustice, vvhich diuines call th'Attribute of Iustice: but the rest do stand stiffely against him, and vvith good reason. For then it should followv, that not only men, but deuilles also are iust, bicause as God is in al creatures euen in the deuilles by his *essence, povver*, and *præsence*, so is he by his diuine attributes, and consequently by his essential iustice: yea then al should be juste a like, bicause by one and the same iustice, and could not increase in iustice, bycause the es-

Ex Hosio l. 1. de her. nost. Tép. §. habem°

sential iustice of God hath no increase. Other Reformers cõmonly do hold, that Christes Iustice, which he had as man, is our formal Iustice, in that it being apprehẽded by faith, is made ours by imputation. And so they acknowledge no inhærent iustice, that can stand in the sight of God, but only Christes Iustice imputed vnto vs. Whether this bee so or noe let them selues speake. *Luther* saith, *Est ergo fide apprehensus & inhabitans Christus iustitia Christiana, propter quam nos Deus reputat iustos & donat vitam æternam. Christe therfore apprehended by faith and dwelling in vs, is Christian Iustice, for which God reputeth vs iust, and giueth life euerlasting.* Yea, saith he, *as the Sophists say*, he meaneth Papists, *that charitie is the forme of faith, sic nos dicimus Christum informare fidem vel formam esse fidei, so we say that Christ doth informe faith, or is the forme of faith.* Illyricus and the *Magdeburgians* pronounce in this manner: *Iustitia quam Deus impio imputat, &c. the Iustice which God imputeth to a sinner, are not qualities or our vertues, nor the essence of God or his diuine and substantial Iustice* (as Osiander sayd) *but al the worke that Christe man and God in one person, our mediatour, did for al mankind.* The *Lutherans* also both softe, and hard, hold firmely and stiffely that Christes Iustice

Luth. Gal. 2.

Cent. 13. 2. col. 128.

Luth. in c. 4. Gal. Lutherani in colloq. Ebing

obedience, and merit, is that vvhich is imputed vnto vs. To the *Lutheranes* do subscribe *Caluin*, and the *Caluinists*. *Caluin* saith plainly, *that he shalbe iust by faith, vvho being excluded from the iustice of vvorkes, apprehendeth Christes iustice by faith, vvith vvhich iustice he being cloathed, appeareth in the sight of God not as a sinner but as iuste. So vve interpret simply Iustification, as an acceptance, by vvhich God counteth vs being receued into grace, for iuste.* And again, *quare ergo iustificamur? &c. vvhy then are vve iustified? bicause vvee apprehend by faith Christes iustice by vvhich only vvee are iustified.* So that al these men do aggree that there is no inhærét iustice in vs, but only Christes iustice is imputed vnto vs, & wee for it are reputed iust, though wee be in deed sinners: and therfore vvhen these man say that faith iustifieth vs, they mean not that it is the formal, but only that it is ye instrumental cause of our iustification, in that it apprehendeth Christes iustice vvhich is imputed to vs, but the only formal cause in their opiniõ, is Christes iustice. And therfore *Sotcliff* vvho denyeth Christes iustice to be the only formal cause of our iustificatiõ, and auerreth besides that, an imperfect iustice inhærét in vs, forsaketh these his Fathers and founders. Yet he shaketh handes in this

Cal. l. 3. Inst. c. 11. §. 2. Impr. Gen. 1552.

See lib. 3. Inst. ca 3. §. 1. Impr. Gal. an. 1562.

vvith *Bucer* and *Kemnitius*, vvho being prest vvith scriptures, vvhich argue an inherent Iustice, did graunt that there is an inherent Iustice in vs, cõsisting in faith hope and charitie, vvhich yet they say is so imperfect, that it is not able to vvash out the blotte of sinne or truly to iustifie vs, and therfore can not stand in the Iudgement and againſt the Iustice of God, vvherfore they auouch also that the only Iustice, vvhich can stand in Gods iudgement and can vvarraunt vs, is Christes Iustice imputed vnto vs. So that they also confesſ that the only Iustice which makes vs at least perfectly Iust, is Christes Iustice imputed vnto vs, and consequently I haue conuinced them to say and hold as I had charged them, and *Sotcliff* in vayn goeth about to excuse them, vvhich yet he vvas enforced to do, bicause he could not else auoyd the absurditie, vvhich I had inferred and shal again anone inferre as necessarily followving this doctrine. to vvit, that noe good vvorkes are necessary, noe euil vvorkes hurtfull, no lavves bynding, if that doctrine be true.

Bucer. In Act. Colloq. vlt Ratisp. propos. 1. et lib. oblato Carolo Imp. Ratisponæ. Kem. apud Tiletan. Apol. pro conc. Trid. c. de iustitia.

3. Novv that these men do also hold, or must holde that there are noe good workes nor merites, nor satisfactions, but Christes,

in vs, it is playn. For vvhen they say that wee are iustifyed by Christes Iustice, they mean his obedience, his satisfactions, and merites, yea *Illyricus* meaneth Christes vvholle life. And consequently if al Christes vvorkes & life be ours, there is none necessarie in vs, if Christes vvorkes be sufficient to make vs iust: and so vvee need not care for good workes, especially meritorious or satisfactorie vvorkes, Christs merits and satisfactions being formally ours, in these mens opiniõs. Yea if ther bee no inhærent Iustice in vs by vvhich vvee are truly sanctified, ther can bee no true merits nor satisfactions in vs; they being the effects of iustification, and consequently if vvee bee not truly iust by inhærent Iustice, but only reputed iust by Christs extrinsecal iustice, vvhich is imputed vnto vs, as the aforesayd Reformers say, then is there noe true merit nor satisfaction in vs, vvhich also these men freely confesse. And although Catholikes hold that a sinner may do moral good vvorkes vvhich are noe sinnes, but moral vertues, though not auailable to life euerlasting: yet *Lutber* and *Calum*, and their suite and retinevv, do say, that al the good vvorkes not only of sinners, but euen of the iuste, are sinnes, vvorthy dam-

Tho. 1. 2. q 114.

Calvi 3. Inst. c. 14. §. 12.

nation, though faith maketh them not to
Luth. ar. 33. 32. 36. bee imputed. So saith *Luther* in his *Articles*
Calu. l. 3. c. 12. l. 3. c. 14 §. 2. etc. and to him subscribeth *Calum* who sayth that all our Iustice is abomination before God, and that therfor wee must rely only on Christes merits: and though *Calum* commend the moral vertues of Pagans as guiftes of God, yet in the same place, hee calles them but imaginarie vertues, and noe more vertues then certain vices are, which seeme to bee vertues, as prodigalitie seemeth to be liberalitie. and after this he endeuoureth to proue that the good workes euen of the faithfull and regenerated, are of them selues damnable sinnes: contrarie to his dulheaded Scholler *Sotcliff*, who sayth, *the iuste do good workes pleasing God*. Wherfore *Calum* denieth al merit in vs, and wisheth that the Fathers had neuer vsed the word *Merit*. In which he speaketh consequently. for if our actions be sinnes, they can nether be meritorious nor satisfactorie. By which *Sotcliff* may see, if he haue not watched his eyes out at Tables, that in this opinion, there is noe Iustice but Christes Iustice, noe merites but Christes merits, noe satisfactions but Christes satisfactions, no good workes but Christes good workes, and so wee are not to be

§. 4. 9. 11.

Supra.

l. 3. Inst. c. 25 §. 2.

sollicitous for doing good vvorkes, bicause it is vayn to carke and care for that vvhich is is not in our power, only vvee are to rely on Christes merites and vvorkes, vvee our selues being not able to do any. vvherfore *Luther* speaking in this as consequently as one, absurditie can follow another, saith, *faith only is necessarie to iustifie vs, al other thinges are free neither commaunded nor forbidden.* That no lavv byndeth vs according to the former opiniō of imputatiue Iustice, it is as easie to proue. For first the first and cheefest Doctours of this nevv Church do expressely teach soe. *Luther* in his booke of *Christian libertie*, and in his *Commentaries*, vppon the *Epistle* to the *Galathians* affirmeth, that by Christe wee are freed not only from the ceremonial and Iudaical lavves of the Ievves, but also from the moral lavv, and euen the Decalogue or 10. cōmaundements. *Caluin* saith that hetherto tendeth thew holle *Epistle* to the *Galathians*, *to shew vs that Christe hath freed vs from al lawes, and that they are sottish Interpretours who think that S. Paule freeth vs only from the yoke of the Ceremonial law.* And a litle before that, he saith that Christian libertie consisteth in three thinges, vvherof the first is, *that the consciences of the faithful, vvhen a trust and confidence of*

Luth com. in cap. 2. Gal.

Luth l de libertate Christ. et in com. Gal.

l. 3. Inst. c. 19. §. 3.

*their Iustification is to be sought for, do lift them selues vp aboue the law, and forget al Iustice of the lawe. For seing that the lawe (as else where is demonstrated) leaueth no man Iuste, either wee are excluded from al hope of Iustification, or else wee must be freed from the lawe, and so also, that no consideration be had of good workes.* And so *Sotcliff* is an *Apostata*, and hath denyed his best Maisters, who saith contrarie to them: *wee do directly affirm that Gods law doth bynd in conscience.* And as *Luther* and *Caluin* say, so holding the former opinion, they must say, that no lawe byndeth, and *Sotcliffs* opinion is not coherent, which holdeth with them that wee are Iust at least perfectly by Christes iustice apprehēded by faith, and yet holdeth that Gods law doth bynd in conscience. For if Christes Iustice apprehended by faith be ours, then so long as we hold that faith, wee are iust. I demaund then whether a faithfull man may transgresse the lawe or noe, that is whether he may do that which the law forbiddeth, or omit which it biddeth? To say that he can not do against the lawe, is against experience, yea and against *Luther*, and *Caluin*, who say that al our workes are sinnes and consequently against the lawe. Then I aske further, whether this transgression of

the

the lavve expelleth faith or noe? If they say it expelleth faith, in so saying they cõtradict *Calum*, vvho auoucheth that faith once had; can not be lost, and they must confesse that every theef, murderer, fornicatour, is an infidel bicause hee loseth his faith: and so al the sinners in *Sotcliffes* Church are infidels. If he say that this trãsgression expelleth not faith, he must say also, that it expelleth not iustice, bicause faith vvhich apprehendeth Christes iustice, iustifieth: if it expell not iustice then the faithfull man, not-vvithstanding that he doth cõtrarie to the lavve, is still iust, if still iuste, the transgression of the lavv hurteth him not, bicause it depriueth him not of iustice; if it hurt him not, then the lavv byndeth him not in conscience, bicause it is no sinne, or is not reputed as sinne to transgresse the lavv, so long as by faith vvee hold fast Christes iustice. By the same argument I proue, if the former doctrine bee true, that no sinne can hurt vs. For I demaund vvhether a faithfull man by sinning loseth his faith, or noe. If *Sotcliff* say he loseth his faith, then faith contrarie to *Calum*, may be lost, and then *Sotcliff* as ofte as he lyeth, rayleth, brawleth, committeth fornication in deed or desire, becommeth an infidel, bicause he

1 Iust. c. 4.

supra.

looseth his faith. If he say hee looseth it not, then sinne consisteth with faith, if it consist with faith, it consisteth with iustice and sanctification, bicause faith apprehending Christes iustice, iustifieth: if it consist with iustice, it hurteth not, bicause the faithfull man is still iust or reputed iust, and as iust, as before, and so by sinning receueth no harme. And so *Sotcliff* must eate those his wordes: *Wee beleeue that al sinnes do hurt those that do them*: and then he shalbe his Father *Luthers* white Sonne, who saith consequently, that *bona opera non faciunt bonum virum nec malum malum, good workes make not a good man, or euil workes an euil man*: and in expresse termes he saith, *where faith is, no sinne can hurte*: and *that no sinnes can damne a man, but only incredulitie.*

Luth. l de christiana libert.

Luth. ser. Sic Deus dilexit l. cap. Bap.

Hēce I inferre my cōclusiō, that this doctrine maketh Christe an absurd redeemer. For if Christe hath soe redeemed vs, that his obedience merites, and good workes are ours, and that none on our parte are necessarie, & hath so freed vs from the law, that no law can bind vs in conscience, noe sinne can hurt vs: then may wee neglect al good workes, merites, and satisfactions, bicause Christes workes alone do suffice, and ours are not necessarie, and wee need not to feare any

sinne, bicause no sinne can hurt vs: and so Christe is an absurd Redeemer, so to redeeme vs from sinne, as to giue vs occasion to neglect al good vvorkes, and to feare noe sinnes, those being not able to do vs any good, bicause Christes workes do al, & ours are so farre from iustifying that they are sinnes: these being not able to hurt vs, bicause Christes Iustice being reputed ours, no sinne can be imputed: vvhich is an absurd redemption, so to redeem vs from sinne, as to giue vs occasion of sinne, and so to lift vs vp, out of sinne, as vvee may be plunged the deeper in sinne. This I haue illustrated by an example of an indulgent father, who payeth al his sonnes debtes before hand, and by an ample discourse, to vvhich *Sotcliff* hath not answvered, nether euer vvill to that, or to this, bicause he can not. But novv vve must answver *Sotcliffes* obiections.

4. First he saith that *I do contradict Scriptures*, in saying *that Christe vvith one vvord or teare or dropp of bloud, might haue redeemed vs*: and then he allageth Scriptures vvhich attribute our redemption to Christes death and passion. But vvhat I sayd, S. *Ciprian*, *saint Chrysostome*, and *Clement* the *sixt* sayd before mee, as I haue aboue declared, treating of

*Indulgences*: nether doth this contradict Scriptures, for they speake *de facto* I speake *de possibili*, they speake of that which was, I of that which might haue been. Yea I expressely graunt that we are redeemed by Christes death, though a word or one drop of bloud, yea euery action of Christe for the dignitie of his diuine Person, might haue sufficed: for these are my wordes: *whereas with one teare he might haue redeemed vs, he would shed his bloud for vs, and whereas one drop had been sufficient, he powred out all*, &c. Or if *Sotc.* will needes haue it, that only Christes death was sufficient to satisfie for vs and to pay the price of our Redemption, hee shall detract sacrilegiously from the other workes and operations of Christe, and hee must needes say with al, that Christes death was only the iuste price of our ransom, and no more, bicause lesse then that could not suffice: and so it shal follow, that wee were not ransomed by a copious, but only by a iust price, and that the satisfaction was not greater then the debte, which is contrarie to the Scriptures and Fathers by me aboue alleaged. Or if *Sotcliff* graunt that lesse then Christes death was able to ransom vs, his argument against mee, shall take hold of

fol. 111. pag. 1. n. 7

him selfe: because, if I contradict scriptures, in saying that Christe by one drop of his bloud might haue redeemed vs, hee also cõtradicteth them in saying that Iesse then Christes death would haue sufficed, whereas scripture attributeth our redemption to the death of Christe.

5. Secondly he fyndeth fault that I talke of a *storme in heauẽ, where there is and always was such quiet and content.* But here he cauilleth for want of matter, or erreth grossely for want of wit. For if he meane a storme of winde or hayle, his wittes were frozen that made so grosse a conceite: if he meane dissension, as I did, which is a metaphorical storme, he is no diuine to deny, that euer in heauen was any such storme. For although since the Angels were *in termino*, enriched with glorie and confirmed in grace, there is and euer shalbe, vnspeakeble peace in heauen, they alcõforming them selues to Gods will *in volito materiali & formali*, as *saint Thomas* and diuines say: yet whilest the Angels were *in vijs* and not *in termino*, that is whilest yet they knew God by faith and not by cleare vision, they were at contention and debate, *Lucifer* ambitiously aspiring to be like to God, and the euil Angels holding

His 2. obiection.

Tho. 1. 2. q 19. a. 10. Tho 1. p. q. 62. a 6. Tho. 1. p. q. 62. a 2. Tho. 1. p. q 63 a. 3.

vvith him against God: Michael and his troupes standing for God and his honour
Isa. 14. most firmly and stoutly against thē. Vvhich also vvas rayled in heauen, where they were al created, though presently after their pride and proud contention, the euil angels vvere
Greg. li. 2. Cap. 6. cast from heauen to hel. And this metaphorical storme I meant, vvhen declaring hovv the second person in Trinitie vvas fittest to performe the office of a Mediatour, I sayd: *Briefly, vvho fitter to appease the storme, then Ionas for vvhom the storme vvas raysed? for it was no other then the Sonne of God for vvhom the storme in heauen vvas raysed, vvhē Lucifee would be like the highest.* &c. and this my conceipt is
Bern. ser. 1 de Aduēt. the conceipt of *saint Bernard* in his first Sermon of *Aduent*, and *Sotcliffes* conceipt of a material storme of vvinde or hayle, vvas a mariners conceit, newly comming from the stormy sea.

His 3 obiection. 6. Thirdly *Sotcliff* hath espyed as he thinkes a great contradiction, bicause I sayd *that man by sinne becam a slaue to his flesh and sinne, and a captiue to the deuil and Hel also, vvhere the deuil holdeth sinners perpetually. For*, saith he, *this ouerthrovveth free vvill and Purgatorie, vvo Bulvvarkes of Poperie.* And vvhy Sir Sotcliff do I ouerthro v free vvill? bicause, saith he

ſlauerie and captiuitie can not ſtand vvith freedom and libertie. And could you not ſee, hovv I ſay only that man by ſinne became a ſlaue, but by Chriſtes grace vvas ſet at libertie? So that hee vvho by ſinne (if Chriſt had not giuen him grace) had been a ſlaue to ſinne, not able to auoid it nor to ridde him ſelfe of it, and a bondman to his fleſh and the deuil, not able to reſiſt them: is novv by Chriſte made a freeman, and ſo hath free-vvill and libertie: bicauſe by Chriſtes grace he may riſe from ſinne, and being riſen he may perſeuer in grace, and by this grace, hee may reſiſt the fleſh, and keep his ſtanding againſt the deuil. Or vvhy, Sir *Sotcliff*, do I ouerthrow Purgatorie? bicauſe, ſaith he, you ſay that the deuil holdeth ſinners in Hel perpetually. O vvhat patience, is required to deale vvith this cauilling and childiſh diſputer. I ſpake Sir cauiller, of the Hel of the damned vvhich is called the lovveſt Hell out of vvhich is no Redemption, vvhich doth not ouerthrovv Purgatorie, this being another Hel, or an higher place in Hel, (as *Limbus* alſo vvas) out of vvhich by prayers and oblations for the dead, and by patient induring, many dayly are freed, and from thence conueighed to heauen, as aboue I

haue ol. 100.

haue demonstrated and by this, his other cauil *pag.* 49. is answered: for vvee say not that the Pope by Indulgences (as *Sorcl:* falsely imposeth) may redeem soules from the Hel of the damned, but only that he may by indulgences free them from Purgatorie. for if the Soules in Purgatorie be capable of oblations and prayers, they are capable also of Indulgences and the treasure of Christes and his saintes satisfactions, which the Pope, as being cheefe Pastour, is especially & principally to distribute and distribute, as aboue also is declared.

His 4 objection.

7. Fourthly he findeth fault that I teach that *euery man is to satisfie for his sinnes after baptism.* And what absurditie, good Sir, do you finde in this doctrine? *Then* (sayth he) *Christe is but Halfe a redeemer.* Not so Sir: rather you haue but halfe a memorie. For you your selfe in this selfe same chapter pag 47. do confesse *that the fathers sometymes account th' obedience of the lavv to bee a satisfaction*, and so, if I, in saying that notvvithstanding Christes satisfaction, vvee also must make satisfaction by pœnaunce, prayers, almesdeedes, and such like, do make Christe but halfe a Redeemer: you your selfe do make him also but halfe a Redeemer, vvho also cal our obedience to

the lavv, ſatisfaction. But if you had but halfe the vvitte of a diuine, you might haue ſeen, that yet Chriſte is a vvholle Redeemer: bicauſe our Redeemer is only hee, that payeth the price of our Redemption and ranſom, vvhich only Chriſte did: vvee only do ſatisfie for our ſinnes in applying this price by the aforeſayd vvorkes, and in cooperating to Chriſtes grace, vvhich wee receeue from his paſſion. And that thus vvee may ſatisfie for our ſinnes, aboue I haue proued: & that in this ſenſe the fathers generally do hold ſatisfaction, *Caluin* him ſelfe confeſſeth. 8. Fiftly, not fynding ſufficient matter in the contentes of this chapter, he raungeth and runneth to the Schoolemē: yet nameth none in particuler. *They ſtick not to ſay* (ſaith he) *that the Sonne of God aſſuming the nature of Thomas Aquinas, or ſome other might haue redeemed the vvorld.* And vvhat inconuenience fynde you in this? If the Sonne of God, by aſſuming that humain nature vvhich he tooke of the Virgin Marie and of the ſeed of Abraham, hath redeemed vs: vvhy might he not haue redeemed vs by aſſuming ſome other humain nature of ſome other vvoman, and euen that indiuidual nature that *Thomas Aquinas* had? *This*, ſaith *Sotcliff*, *is contrarie to*

Aboue pag. 113.

l. 3. Inſt. c. 4. §. 38.

His 5. obiection.

*al the promises made to the fathers, concerning the Messias to come of the seed of Abraham.* O the deep vvit of a *Sotcl*: that can not distinguish betvvixt *factum* and *possibile*, that vvhich is, and that vvhich might haue been. There is, Sir Deane, noe more cõtrarietie, to say, that notvvithstanding God promised to take Flesh of the seed of Abraham, and did in deed take it, yet he might haue taken flesh of some other vvoman and familie: then to say, that although *Mattheuv Sotcliff* hath vndertaken to answer the *Survey*, yet a vviser man might, and should, haue taken the matter in hand.

9. Sixtly, he accuseth me of a great blasphemie, that I say pag. 26. *that Christes passion vvas not our formal iustification nor satisfaction*: but only the meritorious *cause of our Redemption.* Hence he inferreth, *that if Christe did not formally satisfie for vs, he dyed almost in vaine, and that Christe hath not saued or redeemed vs, but vve are to saue and redeem our selues as vvel as vve can.* I answer, that as I sayd, so I say still, that nether Christe nor his passion or iustice vvas our formal iustice or satisfaction: only our inhærent iustice and satisfaction is our formal iustice and satisfaction, for vvch not vvithstanding vve are to than-

ke Christe, bicause hee by his passion deserued grace for vs, by vvhich vve are formally iuste, and do formally satisfie. For if he had been our formal satisfaction, vvee needed not to care for sinnes, they being satisfied for before hand: and if he or his passion be our formal iustice, then do vvhat soeuer vve vvill, vve must needes be iuste, bicause Christes iustice is our formal iustice, especially if it bee apprehended by faith. and to this argument, though it vvas proposed *Sotcliff*, answvereth not. To his illations I answver, that though Christe bee not our formal satisfaction and iustice, yet he dyed not in vaine (vnless it bee for such as *Sotcliff*, vvho vvil not make their benefit of his death) but, supposing that God would redeem vs by vvay of iustice, and by death also, it vvas necessarie that he should bee incarnate, bicause not any angel could haue satisfied vvorthilie for vs: and mans merites and satisfactions had been of no force, if Christe had not deserued, and deseruing procured grace, by vvhich man might merit and satisfie. and it vvas as necessarie that he should dy, as that his Fathers cõmaundment should be fulfilled, vvho had commaunded him to dye. yet I auouch also, that Christe is sayed

only in this sense to haue satisfied for vs, bicause he payed the price of our redemption,
Bon. in 3 d. 19. 41. and deserued grace by vvhich vvee might apply this price by cooperating to Gods grace, in fasting, praying, almes deedes, vvch are our formal satisfaction. And so Christe satisfied for vs meritoriously, vvee formallie, hee by paying the price of our redemption, wee by applying it vnto our selues. And so vvee say also that Christe communicated his iustice, merit, and satisfactiō, vnto vs, not formally, (for then vvee should bee as iuste as Christe, and could not but be iust commit vvee vvhat sinnes vve will, bicause Christes iustice being still our formally iustice vvee should still be iust formally) but meritoriously, & efficently: bicause our inhærēt iustice, and satisfactions, and merites, are the effectes of Christes passion, in that they proceed from grace, vvhich is the effect therof, and is giuen vs for the desert of the same. And in
1. Cor. 1. this sense only, the Apostle saith, vvee are *made rich in Christe*, not that his riches are our formal riches (for then vvee should be as rich as hee) but bicause the riches of our grace, satisfaction, and merites, are his guiftes
Ibidem. and the effectes of his merites. In this meaning, he saith, Christe *is made vnto vs vvis-*

*dome from God, and iuſtice, and ſanctification, and redemption*: not that his vviſdom or iuſtice is formally ours, for then vvee ſhould bee, not only as iuſte, but alſo as vviſe as hee; but bicauſe he is ordained to make vs vviſe, iuſte, and holy, and bicauſe he hath made vs vviſe, iuſte and holy, and is the authour and efficient and meritorious cauſe, not the formal cauſe, that makes vs vviſe, iuſte, and holy. And therfore the Apoſtle ſayed not that Chriſte is our vviſedome, Iuſtice and ſanctification, but is *made vnto vs vviſdom Iuſtice, and ſanctification*: And if he had ſayd that *Chriſte is our vviſdom, iuſtice and ſanctification*, yet it muſt ſo alſo haue been vnderſtood. For ſo God alſo, is called *our fortitude, our patience, our peace*, not formally, bicauſe then vvee ſhould bee as ſtrõg, as patiẽt, and peaceable as God, but bicauſe our ſtrength, patience and peace is from him, and he is th' Autour of it. In the like ſenſe our inhærent grace and iuſtice is called Chriſtes and Godds iuſtice and grace, not by vvhich God or Chriſte him ſelfe is iuſte, but by vvhich he hath made vs iuſte, vvhich therfore is his by donation, ours by inhærence and acceptation. Vvherfore *ſaint Auſtin* explicating that verſe of the Pſalme *In thy iuſtice deliuer mee*: ſaith, *not in myne but*

Pſalm. 17.

Pſal. 70. Epheſ. 2.

Rom. 10.

Aug. enar. 1. ſaltis pſ. 70.

in thine, for if in myne, I shalbe of those of whom
Rom. 10. the Apostle saith, not knowing Godds iustice and seeking to establish their owne, they haue not been subiect to the Iustice of God. Therfore in thy iustice not in myne. For my Iustice what is it? iniquitie vvent before. And vvhen I shalbe iuste, it shal be by thy Iustice: bicause I shal be iust by iustice giuen mee by thee. Therfore it shalbe my iustice, but yet not as myne owne proper iustice, not as giuen me frō my selfe, &c. So that Christe is our Iustice, bicause he payed the price of our redēption, and by paying it, procured vs grace and Iustice, and our inhærent iustice is Christes iustice, bicause it is his guifte, and yet it is ours, bicause it is inhęrēt in vs and giuen to vs, and consequently Christes death vvas not in vayne, but it vvas most profitable and necessarie.

10. Nether doth it follovv (as Sotcl: would haue it) if Christes passion be not our formal satisfaction, *that Christe hath not saued or redeemed vs, but that vvee are to saue our selues:*

Vvhat is to be a Redeemer.

bicause, to pay the price of our redemption, and to be the meritorious cause of grace, by vvhich vvee may be saued, is to bee the Sauiour and Redeemer of the world: and wee are not to be called Sauiours of our selues, bicause vvee do only apply the price of our

Redemption, by our cooperation to the grace vvee haue from Christes passion, in faith, hope, charitie, obseruation of the commaundements, in vvorkes of pænaunce, in vse of the Sacraments, and such like. But bicause Sotc. is as dul of conceit, as hard of beleefe, I vvill illustrate this by a familiar example. Suppose *Sotcliff*, had been taken prisoner in the Action and voyage to *Cales*, and that some noble Spanyard or *Grandie*, vvho had done great seruice for y^e^ King of Spayn should haue præsented his seruices to the King, for *Sotcliffes* redemption, vppon this condition, that *Sotcliff* should restore the Church goodes vvhich there hee purloyned, and serue the King in his vvarres the rest of his life. I demaund vvho is here the Redeemer? *Sotcliffe* or the Noble Spanyard? Certes the noble Spanyard is the sole Redeemer, yet not vvithout *Sotcliffes* cooperation. Bicause the Spanyard, præsented the price and merite of *Sotcliffes* Redemption, vvhich vvas his seruice: *Sotcliff* only had cooperated to his redemptiõ: and the *Spanyard* had satisfied in paying the price, *Sotcl:* only had satisfied for his redemption, in applying the price. Euen so say I, Christe only saued and redeemed vs, by presenting vnto his

An exãple

Father his noble seruice, vvhich vvas his obedience, life and death, and vvhich was the price of our Redēption, wee only do cooperate by the afore sayd workes of ours, without vvhich Christe vvould not haue his passion auaileable, least it should be an occasion of sinne and sluggishnes, rather then of vertue and good vvorkes. And as he satisfied only by paying the price, vve only by applying it; so he only is the Redeemer and Sauiour, wee are only cooperatours. Yea in one sense, more properly is Christe called our Sauiour, then that Spanyard, *Sotcliffes* Redeemer: and *Sotcliff* had more properly saued him selfe in that case, then vvee in this. For Christe not only payed the price of our Redemption, but also hath by his Passion procured vs grace by which vvee may apply it vnto vs, in doing those thinges vvhich he hath commaunded and required at our handes, and vvithout vvhich, vvee could not haue done them: and so euen our cooperation to our redemptiō, is not only of vs, but of him principally: vvheras *Sotcl.* had only been beholding to that Spanyard for this seruice offred for his redemption, but not for the cooperation or application of it, this being only of *Sotcliffes* force and industrie.

Yet

Yet in another ſenſe alſo wee are more properly cauſes of our own Saluarió, then *Sotcliff* ſhould haue been of that his redemptió. becauſe *Sotc:* cooperation had been no cauſe of his redemption, but only a condition: our cooperatió, in that it proceedeth from Chriſtes grace is Satisfactorie, as vvee haue proued already, and meritorious alſo as vve ſhal proue herafter. Vvhich alſo derogateth not to Chriſtes merit and ſatisfaction, but rather commẽdeth it: noe more then it diſgraceth the vine, that the branches in vertue of the vine, do beare their bunches of grapes. So that Chriſtes is our Redeemer by paying the price and procuring vs grace to apply it: wee doe Redeeme our ſelues not of our ſelues but of him, not by paying the general price, but by cooperating: and ſo he is the principal Redeemer, yea and the ſole Redeemer, if vvee ſpeake abſolutly of a Redeemer, vve are only ſecondarie Redeemers, that is cooperatours, as *Nabuchodonoſor* might haue been, if he had followed *Daniels* Counſel in redeeming him ſelfe and *his ſinnes* by almeſdeedes. And ſo al *Sotcliffes* obiections being anſvvered, and his conſortes doctrine proued to make Chriſte an abſurd Redeemer, their doctrine muſt needes be blaſphemous

aboue fo. 113.

Dan. 4.

and Antichristian, from which proceedeth necessarily so blasphemous and Antichristian a coucluſion.

## The ſomme of the 3. chapter.

Luth. in 5. 2. Gal. Calu. l. 2. Inſt. c. 17. §. 2. l. 3 Inſtin. c. 11. §. 2. l. 3. Inſt. c. 14. §. 9.

ACcording to Luthers and Calvins doctrine which the newe Church hath received, there is no inhærent grace in vs, which can make vs truly iuſte and cleane from ſinne: only by Chriſtes iuſtice imputed vnto vs, wee are reputed iuſte, though in deed wee be not. They ſay alſo that wee can not but ſinne in al our actions. Hence I inferr that if wee be ſtill ſinners and only reputed iuſte by the veale of Chriſtes iuſtice, if wee can not but ſinne in euery action: then hath not Chriſte redemed vs frō ſinne, bicauſe whoſoeuer ſinneth or is in ſinne, is a ſlaue to ſinne: if wee bee not redemed from ſinne, nether from the deuil who tyranniseth ouer vs by reaſon of ſinne: if wee bee redemed nether from ſinne nor the deuil, then nether are wee redeemed from Hel nor damnation, which are dewe to ſinne. The ſame Ghoſpellers affirm that by original ſinne our ſtrength and force is ſo decayed that wee can nether fulfill the commaundementes, and ſo the lawe tyranniseth ouer vs, nor reſiſteth Inſurrections of the fleſh, and ſo that ſtill holdes vs in bondage, nor withſtand the deuils tentations, and ſo he alſo domineereth ouer

Io. 8.

Luth. l. de libertate Chriſt. l. de vita cōuersat. Calu. l. 2. Inſt. c. 7. l. 3. Inſt. c. 14

*vs. And consequently Christe in this opinion is no Redeemer, hauing freed vs, nether from sinne, nor the deuil, nor hel, nor the lavv, nor our flesh.*

*Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.*

1. SOtcliff repeateth the opinions of *imputatiue iustice* vvhervvith I charge them, as though he meant to answver the conclusion dravvn from thence: but in deed he only denyeth the conclusion: and not once endeoureth to answver the drift of th'argument. *His collection* (saith he) *is so foolish, that if ther vvere a vvholle Conuent of fooles in place, he might vvill proue Abbot.* And vvith this iest, the vice departeth the stage. But if he be not so vvise as to answer a foolish collection, then, he that vvould be so merilie disposed might repay him with his own mony, and tel him, that if ther vvere a College or Halle of Asses, he might be Head or Principal: becausse an Asse can deny more, then *Aristotle* can proue. This done, he alleageth Scriptur to proue that al are sinners, but to vvhat purpose I knovv not, vnless it be to proue my conclusion, to vvit that in their doctrine Christe is noe Redeemer. Yet in very deed nether do those places of Scriptur

proue that: only they proue (vvhich Catholikes confesse) that al, euen the iustest are sinners, vnles by priueledge they be exẽpted, as S. *Austin* thinketh of our B. lady, and the Councel of *Trent* beleeueth. But notvvithstanding that al, except the Virgin-Mother, do sinne veniallie, and most of vs also, sometymes at least, mortallie: yet Catholikes can shevv, hovv Christ is a Redeemer from sinne: bicause forsooth, he hath payed the price of our Redemption from sinne, and hath deserued grace for vs, by vvhich (it being inhærent) vvee are clensed from al filth of sinne, and do arise from former sinnes, and may auoid al futur sinnes in particuler, and fulfil the commaundementes, and resiste the deuil and al assaultes of concupiscence. But our Aduersaries hold that Christe hath prouided no meanes to clense vs from sinne, our iustification being only extrinsecal not inherent, and imputatiue not true; yea they say that he hath not giuen vs force enough to auoyd future sinnes, but, do vvhat vvee can, in al our actions vve sinne: and so vve remain still vnder the Tyrannie of sinne, & Christe is no Redeemer from it.

Aug. l. de nat. & grat. c. 38. Cõc. Trid. sess 6. can. 23.

2. Out of their other opinions, by vvhich they hold, that notvvithstanding Christes

passiõ wee remain still vnable, ether to keep the lavv, or to vvithstand the deuil, or resiste concupiscence, but must of necessitie sinne in euerie actiõ: I inferred, that then Christe hath redeemed vs, nether from the Tyrannie of the deuil, nor the heauines of the law, nor th'importunitie of our flesh and concupiscence, nor the mallice of sinne: and to this *Sotcliff* answereth only this: *But if he can not proue that vvee do so teach, then I think, he cannot deny but that he hath sinned in this action, let him therfore name them that so teach and proue it out of their vvordes if he can.* But vvhat if I had alleaged *Luther* and *Caluin*, are not you a bold fellovv to bid me name them as though I had not? and if they say as I charged them vvhat say you to my collection? Certes *Luther*, as in the fift booke and third chapter, to vvhich I referred you, is related, plainly teacheth that the commaundementes are impossible, and are not commaũded as though God thought vve could fulfil them, but only to make vs knovv our ovvn infirmitie. *Caluin* also in his harmonie and *Institutions*, teacheth the same. In his *Institutions*, thus he pronounceth: *But that vve sayd th'obseruation of the lavv is impossible, that is to be explicated in fevv vvordes, and also to be confirmed: because it is*

Luth. l. de ſerno arb.

Calu. Har. Mat. 19. & l. 2. Inſt. c. 7. §. 5.

vvont to seem absurd to the common people. And then explicating in vvhat sense he sayd the law is impossible: *I cal that impossible* (saith he) *vvhich neuer vvas, and vvhich by Gods ordinaunce and decree is so hindred, that it neuer shalbe.* yea *Caluin* affirmeth that our best actions are sinnes: and aboue I haue shevved that they teach that euen the first motions of our sensualitie vvhich præuent reason and therfore can not bee præuented by vs nor auoided, are sinnes: and so my cõclusion followeth: to vvit, that according to this doctrine, Christe is no Redeemer, hauing neither Redeemed vs from the yoke of the law, nor the seruitude of sinne, nor the seruilitie of our flesh, nor the tyrannie of the deuil nor consequently frõ the captiuitie of Hell: and to this I expect an answer.

l. 3. Inst. c. 14 § 9. aboue fol. 92. pag. 2.

3. Another opinion of our aduersaries I will produce, and out of it I vvill gather the former conclusion, to vvit that Christe is no redeemer, vvhich shalbe sufficient to confute the doctrine. They deny commonly al merit in our vvorkes, and *Caluin*, though he graunt that God for his mercie and promise freed vs at Christes intercession, and for his death and passion, yet he addeth that Christe him selfe merited not by his life and pas-

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 15. § 2. l. 2. Inst. c. 17. § 12.

sion vvhich he indured for vs: these are his vvordes: *Equidem fateor, si quis simpliciter & per se Christum opponere vellet iudicio Dei, non fore merito locũ: quia non reperietur in homine (Christo) dignitas quæ possit Deum promereri. I confesse truly, that if any man vvould oppose Christe simply and by him selfe, to the Iustice of God, there vvil be noe place for merit: bicause there vvil not be found in man (Christe) a vvorthynes, vvhich can oblige God, or merit any thing at his handes:* vvhich last vvordes are more expresse in the French edition 1562. Out of these vvordes of *Caluin*, I argue thus. Christe, according to *Caluin*, hath not merited our redemption & freedom, and consequently hath payed nothing vvhich vvorthilie deserued our libertie and satisfyed for our sinne and debte, *ergo* God hath frankely, freely, and graciously freed vs, and Christe hath not ransomed vs nor redeemed vs, bicause he hath not payed any thing worthy our deliueraunce. Vvhich conclusion vvill bee more cleared, by this example. Suppose *Scotus* had been taken prisoner at *Cales*, and that some one in fauour vvith the King of Spayne had begged his freedom, but had giuen nothing vvorthy his deliueraunce, this freind could not haue been sayed properly to haue redee-

*ou rié me. titer ea- pers luy- meſme.*

med him, bicause as buying or emption importeth a price payed for the thing bought, so redemption vvhich importeth a reemption and buying again, supposeth a price payed for the thing bought or redeemed, othervvise the thing is procured only by interceſſion and donation, not by buying nor redeemig. and therfore if nothing be payed it is a pure donation, if the thing payed bee not fully vvorth the thing (as if 10. crownes be giuen for an horse vvhich is rated at an 100. crovvnes) it is noe full, but an imperfect payment, vvhich implyeth in part, a liberal donation. And therfore if Christe merited not by rigour of iustice our Redēption he payed not the price or not the full price of our Redēptiō (cōtrarie to that wch aboue is proued) and so is no redeemer or noe perfect redeemer. cōformablie to this, *Calum*, as we shal see in th'eleuēth chapter following, affirmeth that Christes passion vvas not sufficient to redeem our soules, and that therfore it vvas requisit that he should suffer not only death in his body, but also hell in his soule, else, as he saith, he could haue been but halfe a redeemer: and seing that (as in that chapter I haue proued) Christe suffred not at al the paynes of Hel, and if he had, could

fol. 111. 113.

not haue satisfied by them, it followeth that he vvas at least, but halfe a redeemer: Yea no Redeemer, if his life and death merited not our deliuerie, but only an Intercessour: and so the first Adam vvas more potent in euil then the second Adam in Good: for he made vs truly Slaues to sinne, the lavv, and the deuil, Christe vnless *Caluin* ly, hath not truly redeemed vs, no nor freed vs. And to this vvhat can a vviser man then *Sotcliff* answer?

4. But bicause our Deane can not shevv hovv in his doctrine Christe can bee a Redeemer, he seekes to proue that our doctrine also deptiueth him of the same title: vvch if it vvere graunted him, vvould not serue him for an answer to my argument, nor for a defence for him selfe, but only for a solace and counfort, of company in misetie. *Our aduersaries* (saith he) *vvil not so easilie acquit themselues of teaching lewdly concerning the article of our Redemption through Christe*: as though he had most easilie acquit him selfe. And vvhy good Sir? *For first* (saith he) *Kellison teacheth* pag. 261. *as before is noted, that Christ is only the meritorious cause of our Redemption, &c. Secondly he saith* (saith *Sotc:*) *that Christe also gaue vs grace by vvhich together vvith our cooperation vvee may be saued and redeemed. Vvhich being* pag. 51.

granted, it followeth that Christe redeemed vs not but only procured vs grace wherby wee might redeeme our selues. Thirdly (saith Sotcliff) both he and his consortes teach that euery man ought to satisfie for his sinnes, &c. But to these argumētes you are answered in the former chapter, though peraduentur not satisfied. Fourthly (saith he) Papists hope by the merites of Saintes to be saued and redeemed. This is a notorious vntruth. for wee hope not in Saintes as in Redeemers, but only as Intercessours: and their prayers and merites are not our redemptiō, though they may apply it, as the prayers of the liuiug do, wvhich obteyning grace for vs, do apply Christes passion vnto vs, not formally but in effect, in procuring grace, wvhich is an effect of the sayd Passion. And if Sotcliff bicause wee pray to Saintes and desire to be pertakers of their prayers and merits, may therfore infer, that wee make many Redeemers, saint Paule shal hardly escape this his argument, wvho commended him selfe to the prayers of the liuing Christians and desired to be pertaker of them: and Dauid that fasted and prayed for his litle childes health, made him selfe his Redeemer. Fifthly (saith he) they beleeue that the Pope by Indulgences can redeem soules out of Purgatorie. To this

Rom. 15. Eph. 6. Heb. 3 & vlt. 2. Reg 12.

alſo the anſwer is ready, to vvit, that the Po- aboue fol.
pe may giue Indulgences to the liuing, as 112.
aboue is proued, yea to the dead alſo, they aboue fol.
being capable of Sacrifice and prayers (as 110.
vvee alſo haue ſeen) and conſequently of theſe ſuffrages. But this is not to redeem, becauſe Chriſte only did that in paying the price of our redemption, but only to apply the Price of our Redemption. *Finally* (ſaith Sotcliff) *in the Canon of the Maſſe they profeſſ that they offer pro redemptione animarum ſuarum, as if the Prieſt vvith the ſacrifice of the Maſſe could redeem ſoules.* I anſvver that they profeſſ only to offer the Maſſe for the Redemptiō, that is th'application of the Redemption of their ſoules. For Catholikes acknovvledge that Chriſte only redeemed vs, and that the ſacrifice only of the croſſe is our Redemption, the Maſſe only applyeth this redemtion: ſo doe the Sacramēts, ſo doe faith, hope and charitie, ſo doth th'obſeruation of the commaundementes, ſo do almeſdeedes, and Dan. 4.
therfore *Daniel* bad *Nabuchodonoſor to redeem his ſinnes by almeſdeeds:* vvch is as hard a ſpeech, as is that other ſpeech of the Canon of the Maſſe. If then my louing countrie, *Ingland*, thou vvilt be ſaued by Chriſte, acknovvledge gratefully that he is thy Redeemer, and The conclusion.

if thou wilt acknowledge this, reiect the newe doctrine by me alleaged and refuted, which maketh him no Redeemer.

## The Somme of the fourth chapter.

*THis chapter hauing declared in what health and good plight both of body and soule, man was created in Paradise: sheweth how by sinne he was wounded and diseased, with foure woundes especially and diseases: and so also, as neither the lawe of nature, nor the lawe of Moyses, nor any Phisitian of those lawes, could cure him: Christe only in the lawe of grace was the man that could do the feate, whom, this chapter comparing with other Phisitians, præferreth before them all. Then it setteth downe the former doctrine of imputatiue iustice, which, as the Caluinists yea and Lutheranes also teach, hideth only and coureth but taketh not away the disease of sinne and so Christe may bee a couerer, but no healer, and no healer, no Phisitian.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

1. IF our Minister would answer directly, he should tel how Christe in his opiniõ, hath truly cured the disease of sinne and not only couered it, but also taken it

avvay. but he goeth about the bush and seeketh by vvayes: saying first *that Christe* pag. 51.
*cureth our diseases vvhen he coovereth them, and imputeth his iustice vnto vs, and sanctifieth vs by the holy Ghost.* vvhich answvere is but a repetition of that vvyich is refuted. For if Christe hath only coovered our sinnes by reputing vs iust for his own iustice vvhich he imputeth vnto vs, but hath not truly vvashed avvay the blot of sinne, he hath only coovered not recured the disease, and so being no healer, is no Phisitian. wheras he addeth that Christe *imputeth his iustice vnto vs and so sanctifieth vs by the holy Ghoste*, those are but his vvordes, for our sanctification can bee no more then our iustice, but this is not inhærent, *ergo* our sanctification is not true and inhærent, but extrinsecal and imputatiue: and so, as vvee are not in their opinion truly iust, so are wee not truly sanctified but only reputed soe, though in deed sinners: & if stil sinners, thē Christe hath not cured the disease of sinne, and so is no true Physitiā. And to this *Sot:* shal neuer bee able to answer, till he graunte inhærent iustice, vvhich truly sanctifieth the soule, and expelleth sinne: and till he graunt this, he shal neuer be able to shevv, hovv Christe is the *lamb that taketh* Io. 1.

away the sinnes of the world, nor how his
Heb. 9. bloud, *hath cleansed our conscience from dead*
1. Io. 1. *workes*, nor how Christes bloud *hath clean-*
Aug. to. 9. & Beda in huncloc. *sed vs from al sinne.* But *Sotcliffs* Maisters denye for the most part al inherent iustice: and *Bucer* and *Kemnitius*, and their Scholler *Sotcliffe*, though they graunt some imperfect inhærent iustice, yet they say that this inherent iustice is not sufficient to expel sinne, nor to make vs truly iust, as wee haue seen
aboue fol. 238. pag. 2. aboue in the second chapter of this booke and cõsequently they can not say that Christe hath truly healed and taken away the disease of sinne, and so can not make him a true Physitian.

2. *Sotcliff* doubting of this answer runnes
pag. 51. to his old vayn of obiecting. *But if his argument* (saith he) *were concludent, then must he himselfe also affirm that Christ is no spiritual Physitian: for he will not deny I trow, that Christ doth couer our sinnes, and that no man in this life is so perfectly cured, but that he committeth diuers sinnes.* I will not deny but that Christe hath
Psal. 31. couered our sinnes, because Dauid affirmeth it. but yet so as an expert Surgeon couereth the sore with a Souerain plaister, and coue-
Aug. eõe. 2. in ps. 31. ring it, recureth it. So S. *Austin* sayth that God hideth our sinnes, not as a thing hidden

vvith a cloute, which is, but appeareth not (for if sinne bee, it can be hidden from God, to vvhom al secrets of the hart are open) but as a sore is hidden with a plaister, which therfore hides it, bicause in recuring it, it taketh it quite away, and so takes it from sight also, bicause that vvhich is not, can not bee seen. And so Catholikes do yeeld to Christe his deserued title of a spiritual Surgeon or Phisitian. But you Maister deane, & your complices auerre, that Christe hath only couered our sinnes by imputing his owne iustice to vs and reputing vs as iust, but hath not take away the mallice of the sore of sinnes: and so Christ being only a couerer, is no healer, and noe healer, noe Phisitiã. Vvheras he addeth, *that no man in this life is so perfect but that he sinneth diuers tymes*: I graunt it, but as before I haue shewed, that although vve al sinne venially and many, and most also, mortally, yet Christe is our Redeemer & hath redeemed vs frõ sinne, bicause he hath payed the Price of our redemption, and hath prouided meanes by vvhich vvee may apply this price and cleanse our selues from sinnes: so, although vvee be al sinners, yet Christe is a true spiritual Surgeon and Phisitian, bicause he hath prouided meanes, as his passion, which is the

generall meanes, his Sacraments, vvhich are ſalues that apply this generall meanes, and giue vs inherent grace, vvhich formally expelling ſinne, cureth quite the ſore, and giues vs health and remedie: So that if vvee bee not cured the faulte is only ours, and the defect is only in vs: but *Sotcl.* and his Mates auouch that there is noe inherent grace or iuſtice in vs, or at leaſt not ſo perfect as to efface ſinne and to cure it: and they ſtand to it ſtiffly, that there is noe iuſtice or no perfect iuſtice, but Chriſtes iuſtice imputed vnto vs, vvhich can only hide our ſores of ſinnes by not imputing them, but can not heale and cure them: & ſo Chriſte, in their opiniõ, hauing neither healed our ſpiritual ſores, nor prouided meanes to heale them, but only to couer them, may be a couerer of ſores, but no healer can he bee, and no healer, no Phyſitian.

3. This anſvver therfore not fadging, our miniſter hath another in ſtore: *Furthermore* (ſaith he) *he is a good Phyſitian that taketh away the payne of the diſeaſe, albeit he can not for the vveakeneſſ of the patient, cure the reliques therof altogether.* O poore anſvver: and o Sillie ſurgeon and Phyſitian. Vvas then the firſt Adame more potent then the ſecond? and could he of hoale and ſound, make vs truly ſicke

Rom. 5.

sicke and sore, but Christe the secõd Adam could not make vs vvholle agayne? I graunt that many diseases are to men incurable, and so a coning physitian may fayle in curing, not for vvant of skil, but bicause the disease surpasseth his arte: but to say that our spirituall sores are so great, that Christe could not cure *the Reliques therof altogether*, vvhat blasphemie is it against Christes passion, and Sacramentes, grace and omnipotencie? And vvhat meaneth this our answerer, by his *altogether?* Meaneth he that Christe could only hide our sores but not heale them? then vvas he noe Physitian? or meaneth he, that Christe could only take avvay the payne but not the disease, as in deed his wordes do plainly import? Then vvas Christe in deed no physitian. Bicause as I haue told him in my Survey, the disease is one thing and the paine another. for as the corporal disease is a distemperature of humours, the payn, is the effect of the disease, vvhich is a burning or shaking, or other griefe and dolour: so the disease of sinne is mallice, and offence of God, and an odious blurre of the soule, the payne of mortal sinnes, is Hel, of venial, Purgatorie: and so if Christe hath only taken avvay the payne (as *Calvin* saith that *Christe*

Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 16. §. 18.

*shal not mount vp to his Tribunal to condemne a faithful man*) then hath he not cured the disease, and so is no Physitian. For a *Paracelsian* can cast a man that is deadly sicke, into such a sleep, as he shal feele noe paine, and yet shal he not therby recure or heale him, bicause the disease, for al that insensibilitie, may work his death. Yea if Christe had only take avvay the payne devv to sinne, procuring that that, shall neuer be exacted, so vvee beleeue that hee dyed for vs; he had been an absurd physitian: bicause he had giuen vs occasion of sinne. For vvho vvill feare any sinne, vvhen he knoweth that vvhat sinne soeuer he commit, it shal neuer put him to payne? And if this doctrine bee true, then ther is no hel for Christians, liue they hovvloeuer they vvill, so they beleeue Christe dyed for them; and so those menaces of Scripture,

1 Cor. 6. Mat. 25. *nether fornicatours, nor aduoutrers, &c. shal possesse the Kingdome of God; And Goe yee cursed into eternal fier, for I haue been hungrie, and you haue not giuen me to eate*, &c. pertain not to Christias, and so al the faithfull shalbe elect.

4. But *Sotcl:* to shevv the fertilitie of his brayne, hath yet deuised an other answer, vvhich must serue, or else he knovves not vvhat to answer. *The soule diseases* (saith he

pag. 52.

*consist in disobedience and actions, which being once done, can not be vndone. but diseases of the body cōsist in distemper, or other euil qualities, which may be removed. although then the diseases of the body may be removed, yet the diseases of the soule can not be perfectly cured, so long as wee liue in this world.* Behold how this man is now become worse in warding, then *Vul Sommer*: for neglecting to ward my blowes, he strikes at his own selfe, and so concurreth with me to his own ruine. For I seeking to proue that in their opinion Christe is no Physitian, he sayth that *the diseases of the soule consist in disobedience and actions, which being once done can not be vndone*, and thence inferreth that *the diseases of the soule can not be perfectly cured so long as wee liue in this world*, and so he concludeth with mee that Christe in their doctrine, is no Physitian. And if you marke his reason, which peraduentur he him selfe did not, that proueth, that nether in heauen our sinnes can be recured: and so S. *Peter, saint Paule, saint Matthew, S. Marie Magdalen*, and al those blessed Saintes, are yet sinners, if *Sotcliffes* reason be good. for if our diseases in this life can not be cured, bicause *they consist in actions which being once done can not be vndone*: then by the same reason those

saintes are still sinners, and heauen is an hospital of sick, sore, and diseased Lazars: because still it is true, that they al, sauing the blessed Virgin, sinned, and this to this day is not vndone, nether can it in al æternitie: because as *Aristotle* out of *Agatho* saith:

Arist l 6. Eth. c.2. *Hoc etiam ipse Deus, soloque carere videtur,*
*Infectum vt faciat quod factum est, atque peractum.*

*Gods power it selfe seemes limited, in this and only this:*
*To make that thing vndone again, which done and ended is.*

ep.ad Eustoch. de cust. virg. And S. *Hierom* knowing, that to bee a Virgin, is neuer to haue been corrupted, saith that God that can do al, can not restore a virgin to virginitie after she hath once lost it.

l.16. cont. Faust. c.5. Yea, saith *saint Austin*, *he that saith, if God be omnipotent, let him cause those thinges not to haue been done, which are done*, doth he not see, that in effect he saith, if he bee omnipotent, *let him make that which is true, false?* For if saint *Peter* hath sinned, it is true that he hath sinned, and therfore to say that God can make that he hath not sinned, is to say that God can make that which is true, to be false. And so if the reason why God can not cure the diseases of our soule in this life, is, as *Sorcliffe*

saith, bicause *that vvhich is once done can not be vndone*: then before God can cure our sinnes, he must bring to passe this impossibilitie, to vvit, that they vvhich haue sinned haue not sinned: and seing that God can neuer effectuat this, it implying a contradiction: it followeth that they in heauen are still sinners, bicause they once sinned, and *that vvhich is done can not bee vndone*, and so Christe is no Physitian, hauing nether recured vs in earth, nor in heauen.

5. Vvherfore Catholike diuines do distinguish tvvoe thinges in sinne, the acte, and the mallice of sinne, vvhich they call *macula*, a spiritual blot of the soule: and the acte, say they, passeth, the mallice of the sinne remaineth habitually after the act is past, till it bee expelled by contrition, or the Sacraments vvhich giue inharent grace so opposit to, sinne, that it no soener taketh place in our soule, but sinne giueth place and is dislodged yea quite cleansed. And so although the act of sinne being done can not bee vndone, yet the mallice vvhich it leaueth behind it, may bee defaced, abolished and cleased, and that being taken avvay, the acte past is no more any sinne, and he that did it, no more any sinner. But bicause our Minister is hard

Tho. 1. 2. q. 86. a. 2. Vasquez. 1. 2. Disp. 22. ar. 5.

of conceit, I vvill illuſtrate this by example. If he in Ireland, or at Cales, had come ſo neere blowes, as to haue receiued a vvound, by the ſvvoord or pike of his enemie: vvee may diſtinguiſh the ſtroke, and the vvound following the ſtroke: & then I ſaye, though no Phiſitian, no not God him ſelfe, can effectuate that *Sotcliffe* vvas not ſtricken, becauſe that vvhich is once done can not bee vndone, yet the Surgeon can take avvaye the vvound remayning, and reſtore him to former health. Suppoſe alſo that in ſome act or action he had conſpired vvith the noble yet vnfortunate Earle of Eſſex againſt his Prince, the act of treaſon paſt and done, can not be vndone, but the offence and ſinne vvhich it leaueth, may by repentaunce and ſatisfaction, bee quite aboliſhed. And ſo though after vvee haue ſinned, the acte paſt can not but be paſt, becauſe that vvhich is done can not be vndone, yet the mallice and ſore of ſinne vvhich remaineth, in Catholikes opinion, may bee recured by inhærent grace produced by the Sacrament, or procured by contrition: which both haue vertue to giue this grace from Chriſtes Paſſiō. And ſo they acknowledge Chriſte a true ſurgeon and Phiſitian, vvho hath procured the me-

nes not only to couer but also to heale our spiritual sores and diseases: but *Sotcliff*, and his maisters and fellovv-Ministers, vvho say that Christe hath not procured vs inhærent grace to heale vs, but only hath imputed his ovvn iustice vnto vs, therby to couer our sinnes, but not to cure them, doe make him only a couerer of spiritual sores, but no healer, and no healer, no Phisitian.

Sore. makes Christ no Physician.

6. By these tvvoe chapters vvee see hovv our aduersaries make Christes passion of litle or noe effect; for by it (if vvee beleeue them) vvee haue nether force to fulfill the lavv, nor to resist our flesh, nor to vvithstand the deuil, nor to auoyd sinne, nor to expell it, nor to satisfie for it, nor to merit glorie: only his passion hath vvrought this imaginarie effecte, to vvit, that wee bee reputed iust though wee be greeuous sinners, and that our vvorkes bee not reputed as sinnes and transgressions though in deed they bee, and so Christe is only an imaginarie, but no true redeemer and Phisitiã: and this new doctrine hath but the shadovv and name of Christian, but in deed is Anti Christian, and the teachers of it, are the neare præcursors (as I like) of Antichriste.

## The Somme of the 5. chapter.

IF Moyses, Licurgus, Solon, Romulus, Plato, Trismegistus, and others be famous for prescribing lawes to their people, how great must be the honour of Christe the lawgiuer to Christians, his lawes surpassing their lawes by many degrees, as is declared? The Prophet Esay calleth him a king and lawgiuer, whose lawe Ilands shal receue, Micheas saith his lawe shal proceed from Sion. And accordingly he enacted lawes. For he commaunded the Decalogue, he cõfirmed, explicated, and perfected the lawe, and he decreed newe lawes for the administration and receiuing of the Sacraments. And reason yeeldeth him this right and Title. For else he hauing plated a cõmon-wealth and Church, if he had not had powre to bynde them by lawe and conscience to his ordonaunces: then he commaunding, his subiectes might refuse to obey: and so he had been inferiour to other Princes, and his Church had been worse prouided for then is the Kingdome or ciuil common wealth. Luther and Caluin, as is manifested by their wordes, say, that Christe is no lawe maker, nether exacteth any lawe at our handes as bynding vs in conscience, whence is inferred, that if Christe made no lawe, but rather hath freed vs from al lawes, he can not worthily be called a lawgiuer, and so is deprined by these

Isa. 2. 33. 42.
Mich. 4.
Mat. 19.
Mat. 5.
Io. 3. 6.
Mat. 26.

lavvlesse Reformers, of that so honourable a title.

*Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.*

1. OVr Minister likes not this discourse, and therfore vvisely calles it a *garment of Schoole-lecture*, and addeth as vvisely, that I *in seeking to honour Christe* vvith the Title of a Lavv-giuer, do much dishonour him in comparing him to Moyses, *nay to Lycurgus, Solon, Romulus, Plato, Trismegistus, and others.* But as vvel he might haue accused *David* for comparing the true God vvith false Goddes: and if he answvere that *David* so compareth them, that he giueth God the preeedence, the same say I, vvho therfore compared Christe vvith the aforesayd lavvgiuers, bicause I vvould shevv hovv farre he surpasseth them. But this vvas but his flourish before he entreth into the combate. Let vs novv see how manfully he behaueth him selfe in this. *Albeit* (saith he) *vvee do not confound the lavv and the Ghospel, nor make Christe a lavvgiuer like to Moyses, or an exactour of the penalties of lavves, as do the Papists, yet do vvee not deny that he may be termed and is after a sorte a lavvgiuer, neither doth Luther or Caluin deny this absolutely.* See hovv dastardly and fear-

Sotc. pag. 52. 53.

Psa. 85. 99. 113.

fully he encountreth. Speake playn man; is Christe a lavv-giuer or noe? *Not like to Moyses*, saith he. and vvho doubteth, but that both Christe and his lavv, farre excelled Moyses and his lawe, as also I haue declared? Nether is he an exactour of Penalties, saith he. Then may *Sotel:* buy benefices, cõmitte aduouteries, and transgresse al lavves freely, bicause Christe vvill exact no penalties, and consequently noe hel at his handes. And so God did but iest vvhen he threateneth hel and damnation to al euil liuers and transgressors of the lavv. Vvhat then is Christe? vvee doe not deny (saith he) *that he may bee termed and is after a sorte a lavvgiuer.* In vvhat sorte I pray you? For that is it, which vvee demaũd. To this he answereth, Mumme. But tell vs, do not *Luther* and *Calvin* deny him to bee a lavvgiuer? *They do not* (saith he) *absolutely?* hovv farre then? To this also he answereth, Mumme.

1. Cor. 6. Mat. 25.

2. Vvherfore I desire the Reader tvvoe thinges. the one is to marke the vvordes of *Luther* and *Calvin* by me alleaged: and then he shal see hovv they deny flatly that he is a lavvgiuer. *Luther* biddeth vs, *rightly to defin Christe, not as the Iustitiaries doe, vvho make him a lavvmaker, that abrogating the olde lavv, hath*

Luth. in c. 3 ad Galat.

make a newv, to them Christe is an Exactour and a Tyrant. And agayn, saith Luther, Christe definitely is no lavvmaker, but a propitiatour and Sauour. And agin, it is the office of the lavv to commaund, threaten and terrifie: but the office of Christe to imbrace sinners, that haue trāsgressed the lavv. Caluin also by mee alleaged expresse affirmeth, that no lavv byndeth vs in conscience, and that in that, consisteth a part of Christian libertie; yea that in this, the old and newv lavv do differ: bicause the old law promised reward vppon cōdition, that vvee keepe the lavv, but the newv lavv conditioneth not vvith vs, but promiseth frankely and freely. Another thing is to marke three pointes of their doctrine: the one, that faith only iustifieth: out of vvhich I haue aboue inferred that then noe transgression of law, can be imputed, and consequently that no lavv byndeth in conscience. the other, that the law is impossible, vvhence I shal inferr herafter that it is noe lavve, bicause lavves can not be made of thinges impossible. the third that vvee are freed by Christe from al lavves, both humain and diuine, and not only from *ceremonies*, as *Sotcliff* expoundeth *Caluin*: vvhence followeth that Christe hath enacted no lavv: bicause a lavv differeth in

1. Inst. c. 17. § 6. et c 19. §. 2. 3. 4. 7.

this from coūsel, that it bindeth. And seing that where ther is no obligation, there can bee noe law, and where is no lawe there is no lavv-maker, if by Christe were bee freed from all lawes, nether he, nor God, nor man, can bee any lavv-makers.

3. But *Sotcliff* not able to make Christe a lavv maker, obiecteth to Papists, that *though they make Christe a lavv maker, and make that a part of his honour, yet they giue the same powver to the Pope* cap. translato de constit. *shevving them selues to be Subiectes of another Kingdom then that of Christe Iesus.* But nether in that chapter, nor any other do Catholikes make the Pope a law maker, in the same degree as they acknovvledge Christe to bee. For Christe established a Church, prescribed articles of faith to bee beleeued, decreed lavves for the ministring or receiuing of the Sacraments, and in fine, abrogated the old lavv, constituted a nevv: The Pope only maketh Ecclesiastical Canons for the better explication of faith, enacteth Ecclesiastical lavves for the better gouernement of the Church, and more decent administration of the Sacramentes. And this povver can not bee denied him, till *Sotcliff* and his mates can proue him not to be the Suprem Pastour

of the Church. And if becauſe vvee giue to the Pope Chriſtes Cheefe Vicair, authoritie to make lavves, *Sotcliff* may infert, *that vvee ſhevv our ſelues Subiectes of another Kingdom then that of Chriſte Ieſus*: I may, by the ſame reaſon, conclude, that he and his miniſters, in giuing authoritie to the Prince to enact lavves, and to their Biſhops to make *nevv Canons*, do *make them ſelues Subiectes of another Kingdom then that of Ieſus Chriſte*. But *Sotcl*: ſhould haue had the vvit to ſee, that the Vice-roy and King do gouern one Kingdō: and ſo as to obey the Vice-roy, is to obey the King, and not to *bee a member of another Kingdom*: So to obey the Pope, Chriſts Vicair, is to obey Chriſte, and not to *bee a member of another Kingdom*, but of the Churche and Kingdome of Chriſte: and *Sotcliff* and his fellovv-faithfulles, vvho refuſe to obey the Pope Chriſts Vicair, do rebelle againſt Chriſte, and *ſhevv them ſelues ſubiectes of another Kingdom, then that of Chriſte Ieſus*, becauſe as to rebelle againſt the Vice-roy of Ireland, is to rebelle againſt *King Iames*, ſo to rebelle againſt the Pope, vvho, as aboue is proued, is Chriſtes Vice-roy and Grand Vicair, is to rebelle againſt Chriſte, and to be a member of the Kingdom of Antichriſte.

aboue fol. 73. pag. 2.

## The somme of the sixt chapter.

GOD being iustly displeased at mannes sinne, some Priest was necessarie, who by Sacrifice should appease his anger: none sufficient but Christe Iesus, the high Priest and only high Priest, hauing no Successors: and he most sufficient, whether we respect the dignitie of his person, or the worth of his Sacrifice: who accordingly performed the office of an high Priest. For besides that he established a Church and instituted Sacraments, he offered two Sacrifices: the one on the crosse, the other at his last Supper, both the same in substance, not the same in forme and maner. By that of the crosse, Christe was a Priest, but not an eternal Priest nor according to Melchisedech, because that was once only offered, and being bloudie, resembled not the vnbloudie Sacrifice of Melchisedech. only by that which he offred at his last Supper, he can be an eternal Priest, he by his Ministers, offring still that Sacrifice in the Masse, and by that only he is a Priest according to Melchisedech, because that only in external forme resembleth the Sacrifice of Melchisedech consisting of bread and wine. And seing that the Reformers deny the oblation which Christe made at his last Supper and continewth in the Masse, to bee a true Sacrifice, it followeth that thy take from him the Title, which God and

*the Prophet Dauid giue him, of an eternal Priest according to the order of Melchisedech.*

*Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.*

1. OVr Minister to vvinne tyme, spēdes the most parte of his answver to this Chapter in triseling, and then deliuereth a short and leane answver, in these fevv vvordes: *Christ is a Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, in regard, that he succeedeth none nor hath any successors or vice-gerentes in this Sacrifice that he offered once vppon the Crosse.* First he saith, that in this chapter, *I rayle not only at man but at God, calling him absolutly an angry God.* My vvordes I confesse vvere these: *many Priests haue assayed by diuers sacrifices to pacifie this angrie God.* but if *Sotcliff* be angry at this (as I heare in deed he is so testie that if he find no body to scold at, he vvill chafe at his ovvn shadovv) hee may vvreake his anger vppon scriptur also, vvhich in infinit places attributeth to God not only *anger*, but also *furie*, and *indignation*, and he must chafe at *Lactantius* also, vvho vvrote a booke of *Gods anger*, in vvhich he reprehendeth the *Epicurians* and *Stonkes* (of vvhose sect it seemeth *Sotcliff* is) for denying God to be an-

Ps. 29. 37. 103. Rom. 1. Lactant. 1. de ira dei ca. 43.

grie. Yet ame I not ignoraunt hovv the di-
uines do distinguish anger, and hovv they
place it in God. First then, say they, an-
Tho. 1 p. q. 20. a. 1. et alij ibid. ger is materially taken for *a boyling of bloud and heat about the hart*; So *Aristotle* defineth
Ar. l. 1. de anima. c. 1. text. 16. anger. And so it is not in God, no not in Angels nor deuilles, bicause they are sub-
iect to no corporall alterations, being essen-
tially Spirits. Secondly it is taken formal-
lie for a passion of the mynd, or a *desire of re-*
*uenge, or rendring euil for euil receued.* So *Ari-*
*stotle* defineth it in the place alleaged, and
apud Lact. c. 17. to him do *Cicero*, and *Lactantius* subscribe.
Th. 1. p. q. 20. a. 1. And in this sense anger is in deuils, vvho de-
sire to render euil for euil vvhich they ima-
gin to haue receued: but in this sense also, an-
ger is not in God, bicause, as he receueth no
hurt by our sinnes, so can he not desire to
bee reuenged, or to hurt vs for harme rec-
ued. Thirdly anger is taken virtually for an
effect of anger, that is punishement, and so
the vvill of punishing is called anger: but
thus anger is taken metaphorically, for an
effect of anger. So the calmest and mildest
Iudge that is, maye bee angrie: bicause he
vvithout al motion of the bloud, and per-
turbation or passion of the mynd, or desire
of reueng, may and must condemne and
punish

punish malefactors. And in this sense, scripture calleth God angrie, and when he seuerely punisheth, attributeth vnto him not only anger, but also furie and indignation: and when he ceaseth from punishement, then is he sayd to be appeased. And if God were not thus angrie, hee were not God, because he should not bee iuste, if he had not the will to punish malefactours. In this sense then, with Scriptur, I called God angrie, and this anger the damned in hel do especially feele, as you also, Sir Deane, hereafter must experience, vnles you amõd and repẽt, and by repẽtaunce, appease & pacifie this anger, as God graunt you may. So God is sayd also to repent that he made man: not that to God can be attributed formal repentaunce (for that is a sorow for that wee haue done) but because in destroying man by the deluge whõ he had created, he seemed to repent him selfe of mans creation: as in deed to destroye that which wee haue done, is an effect of repẽtaunce. This then shal serue for my clearing in this point, and for *Sotcliffes* satisfaction, and perchaunce instruction; who can more easily bee angrie, then define what is anger, and therfore raileth at me, for calling God angrie. gen. 6

2. Then he findeth a nother fault in mee for auerring two Sacrifices, *contrarie to the Apostle* Heb. 9. *who saith that Christe was once offered &c.* But I hauing proued that he offered two Sacrifices, in forme and maner, the one vnbloudie at his last Supper, th'other vnbloudie vpon the crosse, *Sotcliff* should haue answered my arguments. As for the Apostles wordes, they do not at all contradict myne. for, as I had before declared, Christe offered him selfe but *once* bloudilie, but yet at his last supper, and still in the masse he is offred again in an vnbloudie maner, he offred him selfe but *once*, and on the crosse also, for the payment of our Redemption (which only the Apostle auerreth) yet in his last Supper and still in the masse, he is offered for the application of this price of our Redemption.

Heb. 9. 10.

3. This done, he taketh me vp sharpelie for auouching, that Christe, though he hath no Successors (being stil the only high Priest *yet hath many vicegerentes. This*, saith he, *is derogatorie to the honor of Christe.* And why? *because*, saith he, *he is a Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedech, and can not well stand with the Popes general vicarship or the office of Masse priests his supposed vicegerentes.* A good reason,

I vvarrant you. Could you not distinguish betvvixt a succeſſor and a *vicegerent*? If I had ſayd that Chriſte hath many, or any ſucceſſors, I graunt I had derogated to his Prieſthood, bicauſe the ſucceſſor ordinarily ſucceedeth in æqual authoritie, and ſuppoſeth the Prædeceſſour to be dead, or to haue yeelded vp his office: and yet nether doth any prieſt ſucceed to Chriſte in æqual authoritie, nether is Chriſte novv dead, nether hath he yeelded vp his office of Prieſt, but ſtill offereth ſacrifice by his vnder-prieſts, as I had already declared, and *Sotcliff* myght haue ſeen if ether he had the eyes, or vvil to ſee. But a *vicegerēt* derogateth not to Chriſte, no more then the *Viceroy of Naples* or *deputie* of *Irelād*, derogateth to his King: yea a *vicegerent* ſuppoſeth Chriſt liuing and perſiſting in office, though abſent in viſible præſence: no othervviſe then the *Deputie of Ireland*, ſuppoſeth *King Iames* liuing and raigning, and gouerning, though not gouerning there immediatly, and in perſon and preſence. Or if it ſeem ſtraung to our *Dean*, that the Pope, Biſhops, and other Prieſts ſhould be called Chriſtes vicegerentes, I demaund of him vvhat *ſaint Paule* meant, vvhen he ſayd: *For Chriſte vve are Legates, God as it vvere exhorting* 2 Cor. 5:

by vs? what meaneth he when he calleth al
1. Cor. 4. 2. Cor. 3. lawful Priests, *Ministers?* What meane you, sir Deane, and your fellowes, when you cal your selues ministers of the Lord? what meant *Luther* when he called him selfe Euangelist? Certes, not Successors, *ergo* vicairs and vicegerentes, by which name, *saint Bernard* and *Constatine* the great, do cal the Pope as aboue wee haue shewed. So that if I derogate to Christe in calling Priests his vicairs, you also derogate in calling your selues his ministers; yea you in deed do derogate, bi-
Luth. sup. fol. 149. aboue fol. 73. 74. fol. 30. 31. 32. 33 34. &c. cause you are no lawful ministers, hauing nether vocation nor ordination, as aboue is proued.

4. Now what answereth he to my argument which was this? Christes is an æternal Priest according to the order of Melchisedech: but such a Priest he could not bee by the Sacrifice of the Crosse, that being but once offred, and cõsequently not sufficient to make him an æternal Priest, and not resembling Melchisedechs bread and wine, & so not sufficient to make him a Priest according to Melchisedechs order: only the Sacrifice of the last Supper and of the Masse can make him such a Priest, that being perpetually still offred by Christe in his Ministers

and vice-gerentes, and reſembling ſo liuely Melchiſedechs bread and wine, that though it be Chriſtes body and bloud, yet it hath the outvvard ſhevv of bread and vvine: Vvherfore *Arnobius*, ſaith, *by the miſterie of bread and wine he vvas made a Prieſt for euer.* Sotcliff anſvvereth that *Chriſte is a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, in regard that he hath no Succeſſors, nor vice-gerentes in the Sacrifice he offred once on the Croſſe.* But this is not ſufficient to make him an æternal Prieſt, becauſe a Prieſt and Sacrifice are correlatiues, and ſo an æternal Prieſt requireth an æternal Sacrifice, which may alvvayes be offred, as I haue proued: and a Prieſt according to Melchiſedech muſt haue a ſacrifice reſembling that of Melchiſedech, ſuch as the Sacrifice of the Croſſe is not: as I had alſo proued: and ſo though ſome other properties of *Melchiſedech* recounted by S. *Paule* may be accommodated to Chriſt, yet if he vvant this vvch only can make him an æternal Prieſt according to Melchiſedeches order (as he wäteth it, if he offered not a Sacrifice vnder the formes of bread and vvine at his laſt ſupper and ſtill alſo in the Maſſe) he can not be *a Prieſt for euer according to the order* of *Melchiſedech*: and conſequently *Sotcliff* and his mates denying

in pſal. 109

Heb. 7.

Christe to haue offred this Sacrifice, do despoile him of the glorious Title of such an æternal Priest: and to this I expect a better answere then this, which is now, and was before refuted as now, though Sotc. would not vouch-safe to marke it, or marking thought it best to dissemble it.

## The somme of the seuenth chapter.

*Nothing more frequent in scriptures then the twoe aduentes of Christe: the first in humilitie, the secõd in Maiestie, the first to saue & redeem, the secõd to iudge and to punish, or reward, the first to giue grace, the second to take an account how grace hath been vsed. The same Christe then that came to saue vs, shal retourne to iudge vs; and in his iudgemẽt shal exercise 3. partes of a iudges office: to wit condẽnation, remuneratiõ, discussion: but the reformers take awaye these 3. essential partes of a iudges office from him (as is proued out of their doctrine) ergo they make him no iudge of the quicke and dead.*

### Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.

1. ALthough our *Deane* hath some tymes been iudge Martial, yet can he not fynd out the three partes of a iudge

in Christe, according to *Luthers* and *Caluins* doctrine. I had alleaged *Caluin*, vvho saith that Christe *mounteth not vp to his throne to condemne the faithfull*, I added that of S. Ihons Ghospel, *vvho soeuer beleeues not is already iudged*: and thence inferred that *Caluin* leaues none for Christe to condemne at the later day. I cõfirmed this by their doctrine, which teacheth that noe lavv bindeth vs, bicause Christe hath freed vs, and that consequently no sinne is imputed to faithfull men, as Caluin and Luther saye: whence followveth that faithfull men shal not be damned for any sinne. he and Luther also hold that wee haue no freevvill, vvhence I inferred that vvee haue no sinne (bicause no man is to be blamed for that vvhich vvas not in his power) and therfore can not be condemned for sinne. I added that *Caluin* and Melãcthon and others holde God to be the principal autour of sinne, and so can not iustly condemne sinners for that, in vvhich hee himselfe had most part, and to which he so forcibly vrgeth the sinner that he can not resist. To this vvhat answvereth Maister Minister? he seemeth to graunt with his Maister *Caluin*, that Christe shal not condemne any faithfull man, and he hopeth that I also vvill not

Cal. l. 2. Inst. c. 16. §. 18.

Io. 3.

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 19. Luth. l. de libert. Christ. et in com. ep. ad Gal.

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 14. Luth. Ser. Sic Deus dilexit. lib. de capt. bab. Luth. l. de seruo arb. Calu. l. 2. c. 15. sect. 8. l. 2. cap. 2. Mel in ep. ad Rom. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 18. l. 2. ca. 4. l. 3. ca. 23. l. de aeterna praedest. fol. 316 244.

say that *Christ will at the last day condemne faithfull men.* But he hopes in vayne, if he thinke that I will ioyne with him against the Catholike Church, which hath defined, that only faith suffiseth not to Saluatiō, and that therfore faithfull men if they liue euilly and repent not ere they dye, shall suffer the sentence of condemnation. And he counts without his oste, if he thinke I will contradict the opinion of *saint Paule*, who saith that if a man haue *all the faith* in the world, yet if he haue not charitie, it will not auayle him: and that nether *murderers*, nor *aduouterers*, nor *theeues*, nor *drunkards*, nor *raylers*, nor *extorsioners shal possesse the kingdō of God*: and seing that faithfull men many tymes be such (for as aboue, euery sinne expelleth not faith) they shalbe damned if they dy without repentaunce. But I will let *Sotel.* haue his will to wit, that Christ shal condemne not *faithfull men*: for that he accord also vnto me, that for the reasons alleaged, he can not in their doctrine condemne ether faithfull or infidel: and then I will conclude that according to his doctrine, Christe loseth one part of his office, which is to pronounce sentence of condemnation. But *Sotcliffe* hauing taken this from Christe, seeketh to make him a-

Conc. Trid. sess. 6. c. 7. 8. can. 9. 12. 15. 19.

1. Cor. 13.

1 Cor. 6.

aboue.

fol. 241.

mendes vvith another office: *as if it vvere not* (saith he) *the parte of a iudge as vvel to acquit as condemne.* O the poore amends for ether he meaneth that he shal acquit the iust, bicause he shall pronounce the sentence of remuneration vvhich implyeth a declaration of their desertes, and so hee giues Christe no nevv thing, for that vvhich hee hath taken from him: or he meaneth that Christe shal acquit some malefactours at that day, and so he tumbleth into the heresie of the *Origenists*, who sayd the deuils, & damned should in tyme be acquitted and freed: And yet at that day, no place shalbe for mercie, but as the Iudge fyndeth vs so he vvill iudge vs: to life if vvee liue by grace, to æternall death if vvee bee in deadly sinne. And so *Sotel:* hath taken away one part of Christes office, without making any restitution.

2. The second part and function of our Iudge, is to pronounce that sentence of remuneration: *Come ye blessed of my Father*, &c. Mat. 25. That Christe, according to the Reformers opinion, can not pronounce this sentence, I proued, bicause they saye that there is no *merit* in our vvorkes, but that al our vvorkes euen those that go for best, are dãnable sinnes: which being graũted, then say I, though

So Calu. 3. Inst. c. 15 §. 2. Luth. in c. 2. Gal. & l. de capt Bab c. de bap.

Christe may giue vs glorie by franke and free donation, yet not by any sentence of remuneration or revvarding; bicause where is noe desert, there is no revvard, and consequently no sentence of remuneration. *Sotcl:* answereth, that although *mennes vvorkes deserue not the fauour and revvard that shalbe shevved them: yet no man vvill deny that God almightie that Iudgeth of their actions, may revvard them.* I haue denyed it, Sir Deane, and haue proued my denial, bicause vvhere is no desert there is noe revvard: and so for you to say, that God may reward our actiõs though they deserue not the revvard, is to deny my conclusion, but not to answer my argumẽt. For vvhich answer I will giue you novv no reprehension, bicause I haue aboue taken you vp once for al. I could add that you hold al our good vvorkes to be damnable sinnes, and so if vvorkes that merit not, can not be revvarded, much lesse vvorkes that demerit. Vvherfore till *Sotc:* haue studied hovv to answer this argument, I vvill conclude, that he hath taken from Christe th'other part of his office, vvhich is, to pronounce the sentence of remuneration.

aboue fol. 46.

3. The third part of Christes office is discussion of our sinnes and causes: and this I

proue they take from Christo, bicause they make al sinnes æqual, and by taking avvay freevvill they take both vice and vertue from our actions. For if al sinnes be æqual in mallice, they deserue the same punishment, and so need no discussiõ, bicause there is noe differenee in causes. If ther be no freevvill there is no vice nor vertue in our actions, and so it is not to be discussed hovv great our sinnes are or vvhether they be sinnes or noe. *Sotcliff* answereth, that *albeit no sinne is venial in his proper natur, if vvee respect the vigour of the lavv* (and so to steale a pinne deserueth damnation, and Godhis frenship & seruice is intolerable, and he is most tyrannical, to damne vs for so litle) *yet ther is a great difference betvvixt sinne and sinne, and the iudge is not only to iudge of the qualitie of the sinne, but also to examin, vvhether the partie haue sinned or not.* Here vvee see hovv our minister laboureth, but to litle purpose. For vvheras he answereth, that *although no sinne is venial of his proper natur, yet ther is a great difference betvvixt sinne and sinne*, I can not see hovv he can say so in his and his maisters opinion. A Catholique can put a difference euen betvvixt mortal sinnes many vvayes. First by reason that the obiect of one sinne is greater then

So saith Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 8. §. 59.

3 vvayes one sinne greater then another.

another and so to kil a man, is a greater sinne then to steale his goods, and to steale 20. poundes, is a greater fault then to steale 20. crownes, & yet both are mortal sinnes. Secõdly in respect of the circumstaunce, as the end, the place, the person &c. and so to steale to help our parẽtes is a lesse sinne, then to steale as much to liue riotously: & to steale out of the Church, is a greater sinne then out of a prophane place, and to Kill a Priest or a Prince, is a vvorse murder then to Kill a laymã, or a subiect, by reason of the circumstaunce of the person. Thirdly in respect of the vvilles consent, vvhich may be more or lesse free and voluntarie. So to Kill a man in a furie or being halfe a sleep, is a lesse sinne bicause it is lesse voluntarie and deliberate. But *Sotcliff* and his Maisters can not put a differẽce, betwixt sinnes for these respectes. For they make al sinnes mortal and worthy damnation, bicause they are against the law: for vvhich cause (say they) no sinne is of it selfe venial, and therfore *Caluin* to proue that al sinnes euen those that seem least, are mortal, demaunderh, *an vllũ sit omnino quantũlubet leue peccatum quod non legis obseruantiæ repugnet*: *vvhether ther bee any sinne, though neuer so litle, vvhich repugneth not to the obseruance of*

Calvin in Antidot. Sessi. 6. ca. 11.

the lavv. So that they measure not sinnes by their obiectes or circūstaunces, for so to steale a pinne, or a peny, especially to help our father or brother, would be so litle a sinne, that it could not be damnable or mortal: nor by lesse or greater deliberation of the vvill; for they hold that vvee haue no *freevvill* in any sinnes, and that the indeliberate motions of concupiscence are mortal sinnes, as vvee haue seen. but they measure sinnes by that they are contrarie to the lawe: and seing that the same lavve vvhich forbiddeth to steale, forbiddeth as vvel great as lesser theftes; it follovveth that al theftes, and sinnes against that and other lavves, are equal. They affirm also (as I had obserued) al our actions to be sinnes, bicause they proceed from a tainted and corrupted natur: so saith *Calvin* expresse- Cal. l. c. ly: whence followeth that they are equally 14. § 9. infected, and consequently equallie sinnes, as proceeding from the same fountain of infection. And so noe difference being betvvixt sinnes, the same punishment is devv to al, and consequently Christe must pronounce the same sentence, vvithout al discussion of causes. Vvheras *Sutcliff* addeth that *the Iudge is not only to iudge of the qualitie of the sinne, but also to examin vvhether the partie* supra. Calu. sup. fol. 93. &l. 3. Inst. c 3. § 10.

*hath sinned or not*: I must be so bold as to tell him, that this examination being not concerning the qualitie, or difference of sinnes, but only vvhether it bee a sinne or noe, and consequently vvhether it deserue reyvard or punishmẽt, pertaineth to the twoe other partes of a Iudge vvhich are condemnation and remuneration, and so doth not shevv hovv Christ shall at the later day exercise the iuridical acte of discussion of causes: yea if al our actions euen the best, bee of them selues damnable sinnes, as *Luther* and *Calum* say, or if ther bee nether vice nor vertue in our actions, as denying free vvill, I haue proued that they must say: then in vayne should Christe examin vvhether our actions be sinnes or noe, al being sinnes & none vertues, or none of them being ether sinnes or vertues. Hence I inferre that this doctrine is Antichristian, and iniurious to Christes glorious Title of *Iudge*, bicause it debarreth him from his Iudgement seat and Tribunal, stoppes his mouth from pronouncing any sentence, and bereueth him most sacrilegiously of his office of *Iudge*: vvhich Title notvvithstanding, all good and sincere Christians haue euer giuen him in their *Creed*, for these Sixteen hundred yeares.

Luth. in cõsut. rat. Latomia. næ. Caln. l 3. Inst. c. 14. & c 11. §. 7.

## The somme of the eight chapter.

*THe opinion of Luther, Caluin and al their Schollers, by vvhich they affirm that vvee are iust by Christes iustice imputed vnto vs, being related: three conclusions are inferred. The first that then at the very first dash vvee are so perfect and iust, that wee can not be more perfect, bicause Christes iustice admitteth no increase: vvhich is to fall into th'opinion of the Beguardes. The second is, that vvee are al iuste a like, bicause by the same iustice, and so shal haue the same glorie: vvhich is to tumble into Iouinians hæresie. The third is, that vvee are al as iust, or at least reputed as iust, as Christe himselfe: bicause his iustice is al imputed vnto vs, and for the same iustice by vvhich hee is iust, vve are reputed iust; and so consequently vvee shal be equal vvith him in glorie, vvhich is alvvayes answverable to grace and iustice. And so the Redeemed may compare vvith the Redeemer, and the Christiã vvith Christe: and may say not only with Lucifer, that he vvil be like the highest, but that he is already like him, and as good and as holy as he that is the Holy of holyes.*

Tho. 3. p. q. 7. a. 12. Cõc. Vie. Clem. ad vfm. de hæret. Hieron. l. cõ. Iouin.

*Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.*

1. OVr Answverer, bicause he knovves not vvhich vvay to begin his an-

svver to this chapter, beginnes with a calumnie: saying that it *conteneth a packe of calumniations.* And so he would not haue you meruaile, if he giue no direct answer, it hauing deserued no answer. yet he vouchsafeth this leane and slender answer: *although by Christes iustice* (saith he) *vvee are al iustified and acquited, yet ther is an imperfect iustice in al faithfull, in some more, in some lesse, and no vvay comparable to Christes iustice.* But I hauing aboue declared how this imperfect iustice doth not expell sinne, and therfore must be couered also vvith Christes iustice, to make vs seem iust, it followeth that in perfect iustice, vvee are so iust that vvee can not be iuster, so iust that vvee are al iust a like, so iuste that vvee are as iust as Christe. And so if this doctrine go for current, no man must meruaile that *Luther* durst be so bold, as to auouch, that *vvee are æqual in dignitie and honour to saint Peter, saint Paule, yea to the Mother of God, and al the saintes:* nether must it seem to arrogantly spoken of *Zuinglius*, vvhen he sayd, *omnibus fidelibus & vere Christianis, Deus Pater non minus fauet, nec minus propitius est, quam Christo filio suo proprio*, God the Father fauoureth no lesse al truly faithfull and Christians, then his owne Sonne Christe. And again: *aeque tum tantum prorsus*

Sote p. 54

Luth. com in 1. Pet. 1. & serm. de natiuitate Virgin. Zuing. to. 1. in Act. disput. Turgur. fol. 628. ex Caluino-Turc. l. 3. c. 2.

turn

*nuris habemus, &c. VVee haue as much right to heauen as Christe himselfe, neither can wee be damned vnlesse Christe be damned, neither can Christe be saued vnlesse wee be saued.* Neither are the anabaptistes to be condemned of Præsumption, when, as *Augustin Marlorate* relateth, they protest before their communion, that *they haue as much charitie as Christe had, when he hung on the crosse.* For if wee be formallie iuste by Christes Iustice, wee are as worthie as any Sainct, yea as his mother (as Luther saith) and God fauoureth vs noe lesse than Christe himselfe, (as Zuinglius saith) because for the same iustice, for which he fauoureth Christe, he fauoureth vs: and as the same Zuingli saith, wee haue as much right to heauen as Christe, because the same iustice that gaue him right, is our iustice. & God can not damne vs, vnlesse he damne Christe, wee hauing the same iustice to saue vs that he had. & seing that charitie proceedeth frō grace & iustice, wee haue as much charitie as Christe had, because wee haue as much Iustice. And so the Christian may Iustle with Christe, and the Redeemed may march in the same rake, and cheeke by iole, with the Redeemer. And to this sort can neuer answer. Wherfore as his maner is, he obiecteth; in which

Marlor. in 1. Cor. 11.

faculty what he deserueth more then in his former obiecting vaine, let vs see.

2. He saith that the *Beguardes* and *Begunes* perfection, *proceeded from the opinion of Monkish perfection*, and he addeth, *Papists also say that a man may performe the law perfectly*: whē (saith he) *we may conclude, that their Iustice is equal to the iustice of Christe, and that al they that are saued by the lawe, are equal in Iustice: matters some what straunge and absurd, yet following necessarilie of our aduersaries doctrine.* These his collections out of false premises, are not straunge to me, because he vseth mee to them.

3. First therfore it is false, that wee hold the monkish perfection to bee so great, that they can not increase, as the *Beguards* sayd. For although the state of monkes and religious be a state which Professeth to attain to perfection, as the state of Bishops is a state of them that professe to teach perfection, and so are both of them selues, perfecter states then the states of married and lay people: yet it is another thing to be in the state of perfection, another to haue perfection: and therfore monkes by sinne and neglect of their rules and vowes, may fal from perfection, but not from the state of perfection, and they may daylie increase in perfection,

Th. 2. 2. q. 184. a 5 & 186. a. 2.

Priests & monkes perfectiō.

& yet liue ſtil in the ſame ſtate of perfection. And becauſe the perfection of this life conſiſteth in faith, hope, and charitie, and eſpecially in charitie, vvhich is the *fulnes of the lavv*, and the *knot of perfection*: therfore, as vvee may increaſe ſtill in charitie, and grace inhærent, ſo may vvee in perfection: as may alſo euen the religious, who profeſſe a greater perfection then ordinarie Chriſtians do, that is not only to obſerue the commaundements, but alſo the counſels: and ſo from this opinion could not proceed the hereſie of the *Beguardes*, vvho ſayd, that men might in this life attain to ſuch perfection, as they could goe no higher. For religious men by vowing perpetual chaſtitie, pouertie & obedience, the inſtrumẽts by vvhich perfection is gotten, do therby profeſſe that they may augment daylie this charitie and perfection. And although Catholikes hold, that vvith Gods grace, vvhich is neuer vvanting on Gods parte, vvee may ſo fulfill the cõmaundements, as not to tranſgreſſe mortally, and may ſo loue God alſo, as that vvee vvill not admitt the loue of any creatur, which is contrarie to his frendſhip and commaundemẽt: yet not ſo, as that vvee can auoyd al venial ſinnes. And although our *B. Lady* neuer

sinned venially, as aboue is proued, and consequently so fulfilled the lavv, that she transgressed not so much as veniallie, yet might she do this of greater and greater charitie, and doing it, increase ful in grace inharent, and could neuer reach to that perfection, vvhich Christe her sonne had, euen as man. And although not only shee, but also the Apostles are sayd to haue been full of grace and the holy ghost, yet doth not that argue that they had al grace alike, but only that they were euery one full in their state, as vnequal vessels are euery one full in their kind, & yet cõtein not y^e same quãtitie of liquour. And though they vvere sayd to be ful, yet that fulnes signifieth not the top of al perfection possible, but only a great quantitie of grace and charitie, in vvhich euen the fullest (except Christ) might dailie more and more encrease. And therfore S. *Bernard* saith that Christe had the fulnes of a fountain, our Lady of a Flud, the Apostles of riuers, and S. *Thomas* of *Aquin* teacheth, that perfect fulnesse, vvhich admitteth no increase, is proper to our Sauiour Christe only. And so hence followeth not, that vve are so iuste and perfect, that we can not be iuster, as the Beguardes sayed, nor that vve are all iuste

Fulnes of grace.

Bern. ser. de Natiu. Mar.

Tho. 3. p. q. 7. a. 9. & 10.

like, as Pounion taught, much lesse that vvee are as iust as Christe or our Lady, or the Apostles: as Luther, Zuinglius, and the Anabaptistes, haue taught: and Caluin, and Sotcliff, and al his mates must hold, if they hold fast by that opinion, vvhich saith, vvee are iust formallie by Christes iustice imputed vnto vs.

## The somme of the ninth chapter.

*THis chapter hauing commended the great vvisdom of Adam, and Salomon, proueth that Christe euen as man had more knowledge then they and al the Sages, by vvhich he savv God face to face, knevv clearly al the mysteries of our faith, al the secrets of natur, and euen our hidden cogitations, and so could not be ignorant of the day of Iudgemēt, he being to sit in Iudgement at that day, and yet himy haum̄ fortold the signes therof.* But *Luther, Zuinglius, Bucer, Caluin*, and other of the new Christiās *say, that Christ as man knew not the day of Iudgement, vvas ignorant of many other thinges, and profited in knovvledge as other men doe, vvherin these men follovv the Gnostickes, and Agnoites. Then out of this their doctrin are inferred 2. conclusions: the one that if Christe vvas ignorant as other men, he might sinne as they because vvhere ther is a defect in the vnderstan-*

Aug. li. 4. de consensu Euang. c. 10. Mat. 24. Luth. cōc. 1. de Nativit. Dom. Zuingl. confess. ad Carol. 5. a. 1. Buc in c. 24. Matt. Cal. Harm. in c. 24. & 26. Matt. & in ca. 2. Luc. apud Greg. l. 8. ep. 42. Nicep. h. l. 18. c. 50.

*ding, the will may swerue from reason for want of direction, and so may sinne. The other, that if Christe could be ignorant, he might be deceued, if he might be deceued, he might deceue, teaching according to his ignorance: if he might deceue, peraduenture he hath deceued vs, and so Scriptur and whatsoeuer he taught of Christian Religion, may be called in question.*

*Sotcliffes answer, with the Refutation.*

Synod. 6. Act. 11. in ep. Sophr.

THe minister shaketh handes with the alleaged heretikes, though al condemned in the sixt Synod, and is wel content to graunt that Christe was ignoraunt, that so his own grosse ignoraunce may seeme the lesse disgrace: yea he seeketh to proue it out of Scriptures and fathers, which I before had explicated, but he refuteth not my explication, noe, he mentioneth it not at al. The

Luc. 2. Scriptures do only say that Christe encreased in experimental knowledge, and in actes of grace and wisdom, bicause he exercised mo of those actes in riper age, then he did in his infancie, though from the first instant of the Incarnation, he was by infusion, indewed with al science and grace, and neuer increased in ether. As for the Fathers some of them say that Christ knew not the day of

Iudgement in his members, others say that he knevv it not by humain knovvledge, but yet deny not that he knew it by reuelation, others, vvhose exposition is most receiued, say that he knevv it not, as a thing that vvas to be told to others. And vvheras *saint Gregorie Nazianzen* saith, that the Sonne of God tooke vnto him an ignoraunt nature, he meaneth a nature, vvhich of it selfe vvas ignoraunt, though by coniunction vvhich it had vvith the diuinitie, it receiued by infusion fulnesse of knovvledge. To my conclusions (vvhich, hovv euident they are, may partly be seen by this somme of the chapter, and more plainly by the chapter it selfe) he answereth only this: *but of al this great slaunder* (so he calles my conclusions) *he hath noe other ground then this smal and simple collection, that therfore vvee do see* (that is do make Christe a sinner, and one that may deceue) *bicause vvee teach that Christe as man, knevv not the day of Iudgement, and that he increased in vvisdom.* But if the collection be so smal and simple, vvhat a smal quantitie of diuinitie, and how litle and simple a vvit, haue you, that could not answer it? I vvill therfore adde another collection, vvhich you may answer vvhen you haue more vvit or leisure, and it shall

Hieron. Chrysost. Theoph. in cap. 24. Mat. Aug. Li. Trin. c. 12. Ambr. l. 5 de fide. c. 8. Athan. ser. 4. cont Arr. Ciril. l. 11 in Io. c. 17. Basil. l. 4 cont. Eunom. Hil. l. 9. Trin. Gregor. Naz. orat. 35 36. Damasc. l. 3. de fide. c. 21.

no the myne, but the very collection of S. Athanasius, and saint Ioan Damascen. The illation is this, to wit, that if Christe was ignorant, and profited in knowledge, he was man only and not God. For if he had been God (say they) his humain nature, no doubt, had been enriched with al the guiftes of grace and wisdom.

Ath. orat. 4 cõt. Arrian. & l. de salutari christi aduent. Damasc. 3. de fide orthod.

## The Somme of the tenth chapter.

Calvins blasphemous doctrine, is set down, by which he maketh Christe to feare his Fathers tribunel, yea to dispayre also, and consequently to sinne, because his desperation could not be excused by want of deliberation, al his actions and passions being deliberate. And that I might seem to do him wrong, I make him speake in his owne wordes. Whence I inferre also, what iniurie he doth to Christe.

### Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.

1. But what? saith Sotcl. Is Calvin have not these wordes? doth not the R. desperately abuse the readers patience? But what if he have? hath not this Minister a brazen face, that can so boldly come in with such a what? especiallie Calvins alleaged wordes

being so plaine. Doth not *Calvin* in expresse termes say in his French Harmonie, that Christ feared not death as it vvas the passage to passe from this vvorld? *Mais pource qu'il se proposoit deuant les yeux le siege iudicial de Dieu espouuantable, & le iuge armé d'vne vengeance incomprehensible*, &c. that is: *but bicause he proposed before his eyes the terrible iudgement-seate of God, and the Iudge armed vvith incomprehensible vengeaunce: bicause also on th'other parte, our sinnes vvhose charge he had vndertaken by their great vvaight did presse him: vvherfore it is no meruail if this bottomles pit and horrible confusion of damnation, did torment him sorely, or fiercely, and to the quicke, vvith feare and anguish.* And a litle after saith *Calvin*: *Et icy derechef il nous faut auoir memoire de la cause d'vne si grande tristesse: car la mort en soy n'eut pas tourmenté l'entendement du Fils de Dieu, n'eust este qu'il se sentoit auoir affaire au iugement de Dieu*: that is: *and here again vve must remember the cause of so great agreefe: for death of it selfe had neuer so tormented the soule of the Sonne of God, had it not been that he perceiued that he had to do vvith the Iudgement of God.* Vvhat say you to this M. Minister? doe you not heare that *Calvin* saith in the former place, *that not death, but the bottom-*

Cal. Har. in c. 26. Mat. §. 37. imprimé l'an 1559. §. 38.

Abisme & confusion horrible de damnation l'a viuement & rudement tourmenté de crainte & angoisse.

les pit and horrible confusion of damnation did fiercely torment Christe vvith feare and anguish?

n'eut eſté qu'il ſe ſ-tois auoit affaire au iugement de Dieu.

Do you not heare in the second place that Caluin saith, *that Christe perceiued he had to doe with the iudgement of God.* And durst you bee so bold, as to say: *Nether doth Caluin say that the horrible confusion of damnation did fiercely torment Christ vvith feare, nor that he had to do with the iudgement of God, albeit Kellison impute both vnto him?* Novv therfore, you that vvere so franke in your vvhattes, vvhat say you if Caluin sayd, as I charged him to haue sayd? are not you a straunge Fellovv to deny it? and were you not more impudent then any blacke dogge, and more bragging then any Thraso, vvhen you bragged in this maner: *but vvhat if Caluin hath not these vvordes, doth not this Kellison desperately abuse his readers patience?* But vvhat if he haue, may not that (vvhat) be retourned vppon your selfe. O poore answerers that are enforced to vse lyes for answeres, and o beggarlie Religion, that can not be vpholden but by lying. But let this bold blind byard go on, for he vvill not feare til he stick fast in the myre.

2. *Falsely also* (saith he) *Kellison translated Caluins vvordes in Matth. c. 27. v. 46. turning reum, culpable*, and *exitio deuotus*, already condem-

ned. You ſhould haue remembred, that I in that place profeſſed that I related *Caluins* vvordes tranſlated out of his French *Harmonie*, & if you vnderſtand frēch you might haue ſeen the ſincerities of my tranſlation. *Caluin* vppon that place of *ſaint Matthevv*, ſaith, that *to the end that Chriſt might make the ſatisfaction and payment for vs, il a falu qu'il ſe ſoit repreſenté deuant le ſiege iudicial de Dieu comme coulpable: it vvas requiſit that he ſhould be preſented before the iudicial ſeat of God as coulpable.* After that *Caluin* addeth, that Chriſtes cōplaint of his fathers leauing him, vvas not fained, *Mais comme il s'eſtoit preſenté plege pour nous, auſſi il a voulu vrayment ſouſtenir le iugemēt de Dieu en noſtre nom: but as he vvas preſented a pledge for vs, ſo he vvould trulie vndertake the iudgement of God in our name.* And again: *ainſi donc quand ceſte tentation s'eſt preſenté à Chriſt, comme ſi ayant Dieu pour ſa partie aduerſe il eſtoit deſia iugé à damnation, &c.* ſo then vvhen this tentation preſented it ſelfe to Chriſte, as if (hauing God for his *Aduerſarie*) he vvere alreadie iudged to damnation, he vvas ſaiſed vvith ſuch a terrible fright and feare, that it had been enough to haue ſvvallovved vp an 100. tymes al the men in the vvorld. Vvhat ſay you novv Sir Miniſter? vvhat if *Caluin* haue theſe vvordes, *coulpable*

al. Har. c. 27. Mat. v. 46.

nd already subiect to damnation, vvhich he also
Cala. l. 2 Inst. c. 16 §. 12. Imp Gal. 156 a. H
affirmeth in his 2. booke of institutions? do not you abuse not only myne, but also the readers patience? And doth not *Caluin* blaspheme as I had charged him? and do not you impudently face out the cõtrarie, vvith that your interrogatorie *vvhat?* The rest of the vvordes related by me, in vvhich *Caluin* maketh Christe to despair, and to feare damnation and his Fathers iudgement, *Sotcliff* shal fynde in the places by me alleaged, as sincerlie cited as these vvere. Novv therfore I conclude, that *Caluin* is a blasphemer, *Sotcliff* a greate facer, and Caluinists that follow *Caluin*, deformers rather then reformers, vvho made Christe so poore a redeeme, that according to them he feared his ovvn damnatiõ though he vvere the natural sonne of God, and so couragious, that from his courage, al the Sainctes haue borrowed theirs, and so farre from fearing Iudgement, as he that was to sitte in Iudgement, and had al povver in his own handes.

Sotc a facer.

## The Somme of the eleuenth chapter.

*CAluin not content vvith so many iniuries done to his Redeemer, at length bringe him*

to Hel, and maketh him a companion of the damned, as is proued out of his owne expresse and playne speeches, vvhich are related: vvhich doctrine, besides scriptures and reasons by vvhich it is confuted, is also disproued by this that it derogateth to Christes passion, making it not sufficient for our redemption, vnlesse to it be added, a sufferaunce of damnation in Christes soule, and disgraceth his person, making him fellovve to the damned, vvho is the soune of God, and Sauiour of the vvorld: and for this cause say I it is like God permitted Calvin to dispayre at his last houver, and forgetting Christe, to cal vppon the deuil at his death, vvhom he had serued in his life.

*Sorcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

OVr Minister novv dealeth a litle more sincerly, and graunteth, that Calvin expounding Christes descension to Hel of his grevvous sufferings in his soule, saith, as I haue charged him, but yet he addeth this mitigation, to vvit, that Calvin sayd in this sense only, that Christe suffred the paines of Hel, because his grevvous sufferinges of his soule, vvherbyes, might be revvarded, as he thought, to Hellish peynes. But (saith he) this concerneth not them vvho mislike this his particuler doctrin. And thus the Minister vvould be gone; but

that I must talke vvith him before. For first his fauourable *Glosse*, is as false as fauourable, *Caluin* not only auerring that Christe suffred such sorrovv of Soule, as *it might be parangoned to Hellish paines*, but also auouching expresselie, that he suffred the same Hellish paynes, vvhich the damned do indute. This, his vvordes by me alleaged out of his Institutions, vvhich T. N. translated into Inglish and Richard Harison printed the yeare 1562. doe conuince. for there are these vvordes:

Calu. l. 2. cap. 16. § 10. *not only the body of Christe vvas giuen to be the price of our Redemption, but ther vvas another greater, and more excellent price payed in this, that in his soule he suffred the terrible tormets of a damned and forsaken man*: the Latin Institutions haue these vvordes, *diros in anima cruciatus damnati & perditi hominis.* Marke Sir Minister that he saith not, that Christe suffred sorrovves vvhich for their bitternes might bee compared and *parangoned to hellish paynes*, but he saith he suffred *the paynes of a damned man.* Yea *Caluin* as I had alleaged, saith that if Christe had suffred only death and paynes of the body, he had been but halfe a Redeemer, and had Redeemed only our bodies, and therfore vvas to suffer hel paines in his soule, bicause those wee had deserued. and so

O blasphemie.

§. 10. et 11.

*Calum*, besides the paines that Christe suffered in enduring death on the crosse for vs, auoucheth that Christ suffred the paines of a damned man. And he saith not only, that Christe suffred death vvhich vvas so paniful that it might be parangoned to hel paines, as *Sotcliffe* interpreteth, but besides the bitter paines of death, he saith he suffred the paines of *a damned man*, and in suffring them, *payed another greater and more excellent price, in that in soule, he suffred* (as Caluin saith) *the terrible torments of a damned man, and vvraſtled vvith the forces of Hel*, and indured al the paines vvee should haue indured, this only excepted that he could not be deteined in those paynes: yea he saith he had been a covvard if he had svvet bloud and vvater for feare of *death only*. Vvheras *Sotcliff* addeth, that *this concerneth not them vvho misluke this his particuler opinion*. This argueth hovv litle he trusted to his former fauourable glosse: and hovv litle *Caluin* is beholden to him, that thus leaueth him in the lurche. But vvith vvhat face can this bold fellow auerr this? Certes *Caluin* was not euery man, but their common Maister, and a man sent from God, vvhose doctrine in the most pointes they haue imbraced: and seing that *Caluin* alleaged Scriptur,

Caluin in Catechiſmo par. 2. q. 12. & supra. 1. lib. 2. Inſt ca. 16. §. 12.

Isa. 53. 1. Pet 3. act.

as vvel for this his *particuler opinion*, as for al the rest; if his priuat spirit might fayle in this, it might fayle in his expositio of those wordes, *this is my body*, and in al other expositiõs, vvhich *Ingland*, and the *Caluinistes* in *Geneua*, and *Fraunce*, haue receyued against the common interpretation of the present and ancient Church, Councels, and Fathers. And if *Caluins* spirit might deceue him, peraduenture it hath deceyued al the Ministers of *Geneua*, *Fraunce*, and *Ingland*, and *a lying spirit in the mouth of al the newy Prophetes*, especially he being the Maister they the Schollers, and they vsing noe other rule, then he did euen in *this particuler opinion*, vvhich is, Scripture sensed by their particulor Spirits. And so *Sotcliff* denying this opinion of *Caluin*, shaketh the vvholle frame and body of his Church, and Religion.

Sotc. in denying Caluin, shaketh his religion.

2. Then *Sotcliffe* complaineth, *that I most shamefully belye Caluin diuers vvayes. First in saying that Caluin acknowledgeth no local Hel.* Secondly in saying that *Caluin* affirmed, that these vvordes, *my God, my God, vvhy hast thou forsaken mee, vvere the vvordes of a damned man.* Lastly, in accusing *Caluin* to haue despaired at his death. But if I proue these 3. assertions, to be three truthes, vvho then hath shamefully

fully not only lyed, but also calumniated: Touching the first, these are *Caluins* wordes: *Nescio qui factum sit &c. I know not how it came to passe, that posteritie thought ther vvas a place vnder earth, to vvhich they gaue the name of Limbe: but this fable, although it haue great authors, and to this day also is earnestly defended of many for a truth, yet it is nothing else but a fable. For to conclude in a prison the soules of the dead, is childish: and that Christes soule should descend thether to deliuer them, vvhat need vvas ther?* Here vvee see hovv *Caluin* denieth *Limbus* in flat termes, and his reason, if it be vvorth any thing, as *Caluin* thinkes it is, proueth also that there is no hel at al, bicause saith he, *it is childish to conclude the soules of the dead in a prison:* vvhich yet S. *Peter* thought nether childish nor absurd. Vvee see also hovv he denyeth Christes descension to Hel: and so not I, but the Minister shamefully belieth *Calum*, in making him to graunt a local Hel, vvhich he so plainly denieth. But let vs here *Caluins* opinion of the Hel of the damned. Thus then he singeth, but vvith a discord from Scriptur and the Church, in his iarring *Harmonie* vpon the third chapter of S. Matthevv: *As touching the euerlasting fier, vvith vvhich the reprobate shalbe tormented, after the Iudgement, I*

l. 2. Inst. c. 16. § 9. edit. Gen. 1592. & edit. Gal. 1562. Calu. and Luth. deny local Hel.

1. Pet. 3.

Caluin. Harm. in c. 3. Mat. v. 12. edit. Gal. & lat.

knevv that of many it hath been subtilie disputed, but a man may gather out of diuers places of Scripture, that there is in this vvorde (Fire) a Metaphor.

The same Calv. teacheth l. 3. Inst. c. 25. §. 12.

For (saith he) if you graunt a real and material fier, you must put also brimstone, and a payre of bellovves, and a vvorme, bicause Scripture also speaketh of them. Vvherfore he concludeth that by *Hel*, & *Fire*, is vnderstood, *an horrible torment, vn torment horrible.* And so he graunteth only a torment of spirit, vvhich the dãned indure, but nether local Hel, no real fier. But his reason, is childish. for if bicause there is no true sulphure nor real bellovves in hel, there be no true fire, he may proue also that there is no element of fire, aboue the ayre and in the concauitie of the moone, bicause ther are no bellowes there to blow it, nor sulphur, nor wood, to feed it: yea that there is no local heauen, bicause scriptur describes the ioye of that, by many metaphors. This *Calum* learned of his Godfather *Luther*, vvho before him taught the same, saying: *Quid sit infernus ante diem extremum nondum satis certus sum: nam esse aliquem locum peculiarem, vbi nunc sunt animæ damnatorum, sicut pingunt pictores, & ventris mancipia docent, id mea sententia nihil est: Vvhat Hel is before the last day I am not yet sufficiently assured,*

Luth. in c. 3. Ioan. in pt. Gen.

*for, that there is any perticuler place, vvhere now are the ſoules of the damned, as the painters painte, and the bondmen to their bellies teach, that, in mine opinion, is nothing.* This vvas their opinion then: for ſince that tyme, experience hath taught them that ther is a local hel and true fier.

3. Touching my ſecond accuſation of *Caluin*, to that, him ſelfe ſhal be a vvitneſſ: If firſt, I giue our Miniſter to vnderſtand, that he hath made me ſay more then in deed I did. For I ſayd not that *Caluin* affirmed expreſſelie, that thoſe wordes of Chriſte were the vvordes of a damned man, only I ſayd, that from *Caluins* opinion, vvhich teacheth that Chriſtes deſcēſion to hel, vvas nothing elſe but the ſuffraunce of helpaynes in his ſoule, that abſurditie followeth. For if Chriſte began to deſcēd to Hel, when he prayed in the Garden, as *Caluin*, affirmeth he did, ſaying, *that then vvas the beginning of his deſcenſion to Hel*: then, ſay I, Chriſte being in the depth of his ſorrowes (as *Caluin* ſayth he vvas) vvhen he complained in thoſe wordes that his father had forſaken him, and then deſpaiting alſo (as *Caluin* likevviſe blaſphemeth) it followveth that he was in the depth of Hel (bicauſe deſcenſion to Hel, vvas, as

l. 2. Inſt. c. 16. §. 12. edit. Gen. 1592.

Harm. in c. 27. Mat. ſupra.

l. 3. Inst. c. 25. § 12. Mat. 27. *Caluin* sayth, but suffraunce of hel-paynes) and that those *wordes, my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken mee*, were the wordes of a damned man, plunged in the depth of hel. Which Caluin confirmeth, as we haue seen, saying that Christe suffred in soule *the cruel tormentes of a damned man.*

supra.

4. Touching the third accusation to wit, that Caluin despaired at his death, and called vppon the deuil, besides that these his blasphemies were like enough to bring him to such an end, *Bolsec* and *Genebrard* whom I alleaged, affirm it, whose, yea, is better then *Sotcliffes*, nay, especially he hauing been taken tripping so often, and bringing nothing to disproue them: and *Bolsec* being a Phisitian in *Geneua*, who therfore might easilie haue good information, and might know more then by hearsay.

Bolsec in vit. Calu. Genebr. l. 4. Chron.

5. Lastly this minister hauing playd the aduocate for *Caluin*, so absurdly, beginnes to play the part of an accuser, and saith that I *say first that al hellish paynes are without end:* whereas I spake only of the Hel of the damned, and not of Purgatorie, whose paynes haue an end, nor of *Limbus*, in which were noe paynes at al. *Next* (saith he) *Kellison counteth it straunge that Caluin brought Christe to hel,*

*and yet his followers teach, that Limbus Patrum whether Christe descended, is in hel.* But Sir *Sot: Calvin*, brought Christe to the Hel of the damned and their Hellish panges and torments, Catholikes only auouch, that he descended to *Limbus*, which is an higher part of hel in which the saincte of th'old Testament expected Christe in patiẽce and without al payne. And yet again, bicause I sayd, that Christes passion was of such vallew that if he had offred it to that end, and his father had so ordained, it would haue sufficed to redeem the deuils: he saith, that I teach contrarie to Catholikes, who say that Christe came not to redeem deuilles. But they speake *de facto*, I *de possibili*, which you had not the wit to see.

## The somme of the twelueth chapter.

*HAuing proued by the natur of freindship, that if wee loue Christe, wee can not but loue and respect his Mother, his Apostles who were his chiefe freindes and officers, and al other Saintes his freindes, yea and what hath been deare and belonging to him and them, as his image, crosse, sepulchre, and their images and reliques, I set down the raylinges of the new Christians against the*

*Mother of God and al ſaintes, and ſhevv hovv by their doctrine they are not to be honoured. Then I declare hovv Catholikes honour Saintes and images, and hovv this honour is no idolatrie, nor derogating, but redounding to Chriſte. Then I proue this honour out of ſcriptures, and that amongeſt other honours they are to be prayed vnto, and the ſame, in my ſecond Edition, I proue alſo by fathers. I proue alſo honour of Images and Reliques to bee lavvfull, and that by ſcriptur alſo. And then by an example I conclude that the Reformers are no ſincere louers of Chriſte, that vvill nether honour his mother nor ſaintes, nor any thing that hath been deare or belonging vnto him, or them.*

*Sotcliffes anſvver vvith the Refutation.*

1. Sotcliff anſvvereth nether to the driſt of my argument grounded in the nature of frendſhip, nether to other my reaſons, nor to the ſcriptures by me alleaged, nor to the example vvhich in th'end I bring to Illuſtrate the diſcourſe: only he carpeth at certain of my ſpeeches, that he may ſeem to haue ſayd ſomething, and, as his manner is, he obiecteth in ſteed of anſvvering. But becauſe he keepeth noe order, I vvil not follovv him in his order and therfore vvill anſvver firſt to the calumniations vvher-

vvith he chargeth me, before I come to the matter. He ſayth, that I ſay that *Calvin called Saintes long-eared creatures, and that vvicleph called then Scurras Principis, and that Luther wrote that euery minſters yoke fellovv, may be as hoy as the Mother of God. But theſe are calumniations,* &c. Noe calumniations Sir, but truthes, as appeareth by the places alleaged. Certes *Calvin* ſpeaking of Saints, hath theſe vvordes: *quis tamen* &c. *but vvho hath reuealed vnto vs that they haue ſo long eares, that they may reach to our voices?* and in the ſame chapter he calleth Saintes *larvas, vizards*: yea as *Bellarmin* hath related, he calles them *hangmen* and *beaſtes*. Vvheras *Sotus* ſayth, that vvhen *Vvicleph* called Saintes *Scurras*, he meant *vſhers*, let him read *Riders diction arie*, and he ſhal ſee that in that vvord, he called them, *raylers, ſcoffers, ſaucie Ieſters*, al vvhich, that vvord importeth. *Luthers* vvordes, *Sotcliff* ſhalfy id in *Luther* vvhen he pleaſeth to read his ſermon of the *B. Virgins* Natiuitie, vvhich aboue in the 8. chapter I haue alſo alleaged. *Quintins* raylings againſt th' Apoſtles, *Sotus* ſeemeth to confeſſ, *but vve deteſt*, ſaith he, *Quintin, as vve do Kelliſon*. One fault in quotation, I vvill confeſſ, though *Sotus* hath not obſerued it, that I ſayd in the firſt booke and 4. chapter

Inſt. c. 10. § 24.

§ 17. Bell. to 2. præf. in Cont de Eccleſia Triumph.

Luth. in com. in 1. Pet. 1 & ſerm. de Natiuit. virg.

that *Beza* called *Athanasius Sathanasius*, and miscalled the nicen fathes: wheras *Beza* only alleageth another that so calleth them. the cause of th'errour was, bicause this was taken out of *Caluino-turcismus*, where in the margin, right ouer against those wordes, is *Beza*. But yet herin *Beza* is not much iniuried, for the same *Beza*, as *Caluino-turcismus* hath obserued, sayth the *Nicen fathers were instigated by Satan, which is al one.* Now therfore let vs come to *Sotcliffes* poore or no answer.

Caluino ture. l. 1. c. 3. l. 3. c. 3.

2. Thus he beginneth. He sayeth, that in the 12. chapter *I traduce them, as not louing nor respecting Christe, bicause they respect not his mother, nor his saintes, nor his crosse nor his images, nor his nayles, nor other thinges belonging vnto him: And he might* (saith he) *haue added also the Asse, vvheron Christe rode,* If I in this, Sir Minister, haue traduced you, why answered you not my argument, grounded on that *Axiom* of frendship, and Inglish prouerb, loue me loue myne, respect mee respect myne? For the nature of frendship being such, that if vvee loue or honour the Prince, vvee respect for his sake, his mother, children, alliaunce, officers, freindes, yea his image & ring, the they that sincerly loue and reuerence Christe,

vvill beare a reuerent reſpect, though inferiour, to his mother, the Saintes, his image, croſſe, nayles, &c. vvhich al haue a relation vnto him, and are, or were, belõging to him: and therin ſhal they not diſhonour but honour Chriſte; euen as the prince is moſt honoured, vvhen not only hee for him ſelfe, but his mother, allyes, freindes, images, chayre of eſtate, and ſuch like, are loued and liked for his ſake. Vvheras *Sotcliff* addeth *that I might haue added the Aſſe alſo*, I anſvvere that I thought it beſt, to permit an Aſſe to bring in the Aſſe, I hauing good reaſon to leaue him out. For although ſome thinges euen inanimate, and ſenſeles, as the croſſe and nayles, may bee reuerently reſpected *propter contactum*, that is, for hauing been touched of Chriſte, or hauing been imbrevved vvith his ſacred bloud: yet not al thinges. For ſome thinges touched by Chriſte, do imply indecencie and indignitie: as the Aſſe, and ſo are not to be reuerenced: other thinges do import an honour to him that touched Chriſte iniuriouſly, as the lippes of *Iudas*, and the hand of him that ſtroke him. For they being partes of Chriſtes enemies, if they vvere honoured, the honour vvould ſeem to redound to Chriſtes enemies: but

the honour giuen to the crosse and nayles & speare (they being not capable of honour them selues) hath a farther relation: and not to Christes tormenters, bicause they are no partes nor members of them, but to Christe him selfe, by vvhose sacred flesh and blood they vvere sanctified. And this *Sotcliff* him selfe can not deny, in a like case. for he vvil put of his hatte to the Kinges chaire of Estate, bicause there the King hath sitten, and exhibited his Roial præsence: and yet he vvill not so respect euery place vvhere he hath sittē (some places implying an indignitie) nether vvill he put of his cappe to the Kinges horse or mule, bicause the King hath ridden on him, nor yet to his hound, bicause the King loueth and stroketh him, that importing an incongruitie: nor vvould he Kisse *Goaries* hand, that vvas readie to haue stabbed him: bicause, so he should seem to honour the traytour. *Sotcliff*, seing that he was in the vaine of obiecting, and questioning, might haue demaunded, vvhy then vve respecte other crosses of stone or vvood, or painted on vvalles or papers, they hauing neuer touched Christe: and then I vvould haue answered him that such crosses are not reuerenced *propter contactum*, that is, for

that they haue touched Christe, but bicause like Images, they represent Christe and the crosse he hong on. If he aske again, vvhy vvee reuerence not by the same reason, al the nayles in the Smithes shop, which may as vvel represent the nayles of Christe, as those crosses do represent his crosse: I answvere that the reason is, bicause carued, grauen, or painted crosses, are made to the end to represent Christes true crosse, and so haue no other vse: and consequently in reuerencing them, vvee reuerence Christes true crosse, and Christe him selfe: but nayles in the Smithes shop, and other crosses also of vvood in a Ship, or hovvse, are made for other vses then to represent Christes nayles or crosse, and not for that vse at al, and so are not to bee respected; though they that could warilie consider them, only as Images of Christes true nayles and crosse, might also reuerence them, and the reuerence vvould redound to Christe him selfe.

3. Certes *Sotcliffe*, laughing at our reuerencing of Christes crosse, and nayles, like a *Cham*, scorneth his forfathers, and derideth al antiquitie. *S. Ambrose* puttes it among the Prayses of *Queen Helen*, *Constantines mother*, that she reuerenced the *crosse* and *nayles* of

Amb. orat de obitu Theodosij

Honour of the crosse and nayles.

Christe: Sapiens Helena &c. Helen was wise which lifted vp the crosse to the heades of Kinges, that the crosse in Kinges might be adored. This is no insolencie, but pietie, when it is referred to our sacred redemptiō. And a litle after, speaking of the nayles: behold the nayle also, is had in honour, to the Iron of Christes feete, Kinges are inclined. Saint Chrysostome saith, that the wood of the crosse is had in such veneratiō, that they who can get but a litle peece of it, do set it in gold, and hang it about their neckes. S. Austin, saith, that vnlesse the signe of the crosse, be made vppon the forheades of the faithful, vppon the water by which they are regenerated, vppon the oyle wher with they are anoynted with Chrisme, vppon the Sacrifice wher with they are fedd, none of these thinges is rightly done. S. Hierom speaketh thus: to Marcella: the Iewes worshipped the propitiatorie, and dost thou not thinke the Sepulchre of Christe more venerable? And S. Ihon Damascen, hath these wordes: This wood, worthy worship, which is sanctified by the touching of Christes holy body and bloud, by good right ought to be worshipped, the nayles also and the speare, and the garment, and cribbe of Christe. And after so ancient vse of these thinges, and so great commendations of so great Doctours, shal an vnlerned Minister, cal them superstitiōs?

Chrys. to. 5. Quod Christus sit Deus.

Aug. trac. 118. in Io. in fine.

Hier. to. 1. ep. 17. ad Marcel.

l 4. de fi de Orth. c. 12.

Vvheras he addeth *that it is no sign of loue to keep th'instrumentes vvhich vvere cause of our frendes death:* he condemneth *S. Ambrose, Queen Helena, and Constantine* her sonne, *S. Chrysostome, S. Austin, S. Hierom, S. Damascene,* by me alleaged, as Haters of Christe, in honoring and keeping his crosse and nayles: and bevvrayeth also his own vvant of vvitte, to distinguish. For although to affect the crosse as it molested Christe vvere to hate him, yet to keep it and respect it as an instrumēt by vvhich Christe purchased glorie to him selfe and his Father, redemption to vs, and confusion to the deuil our aduersarie, is a signe of loue and honour, vvhich vvee beare to Christe. And thus the louing sonne might keep the svvord vvher-vvith his father vvas martyred, and respect it also, not for that it caused his death, but bicause it is imbrevved vvith his bloud, and purchassed him the glorie of Martyrdom.

4. Then *Sotc:* demaundeth, *how I proue, that they loue not the B. Mother of God nor the Saintes?* & he answereth him selfe, *forsooth bicause vvee do not vvorship them as the Papists doe. But if this* (saith he) *be an argument of vvant of loue, then nether the Apostles, nor first Christians loued Christ or his Samtes.* And how proue you, that

the first Christians worshipped not the mother of God, and the Saintes, as novv Papists doe? He thinkes he must be credited of his vvord, bicause he is Deane of Excester, and the Kinges Chaplein, and therfore proues nothing: but I hauing found him false so often, can not receue his bare affirmatiō. Nay I vvill proue, that the first, and ancient Christians, honoured Saintes as novv Papistes doe, and so this his affirmation vvill proue like many others of his coyning. Catholikes that novv are, doe bovve their knees and bodies to Saintes: and beare a reuerent respect more to them then to Princes & mortal men, yet lesse then to God: So did *Abraham*, *Loth*, *Balaam*, and *Iosue*, vvorship Angels; so S. *Ihon* adored an Angel, knovving him to be an Angel, and knovving vvhat Idolatrie vvas, as vvel as our Reformers: So *Abdias* honoured *Helias*, so the Sonnes of the Prophets, *Helizeus*: so *Nabuchodonozor* adored *Daniel*, *Cornelius* reuerenced *S. Peter*. And this honour they gaue to thē for their Sanctitie: and seing that Saintes liue in soule, vvhich is the proper subiect of Sanctitie, if Angels may be honoured for that respect, vvhy not Saintes? and if the liuing Saintes, why not the Saintes dead to this vvorld, yet

Catholikes honour Saints no otherwise thē did the prim Church.

Gen. 17. 18 19. Num. 22. Iosue. c. 5. Apoc. 19. 3. Reg. 18. 4. Reg. 2. Dan. 2. Act. 10.

liuing to God in heauen, they being there confirmed in grace, and enriched also with glorie? Conformably to this *Dionisius Areopagita*, S. Paules Scholler, bare a greater respect to our *B. Ladie* then to any mortal man or woman. And good reason, she being in dignitie next to the sonne of God, and linked to him also in the first degree of consanguinitie. He in deed was the *Stone* cut of without handes, but she the mountain from which it was cut: he was the grape pressed on the crosse, but she the vine that bare it: hee the frute of life, shee the tree: he the *light of the world*, she the golden Cãdlestick that supported it: he the flowre shee the rodd of *Aron* dryé from concupiscence, out of which the flowre sprouted: he the Honie, shee the Hony combe: He the bread shee the ouen in which the bread was baked, not by the fier of concupiscence, but of the Holie Ghost: He the *Manna*, she the golden potte that conteined it: He the *dew* that fel from heauen, shee the *Gedeons fleese* on which it fell? He the word, and wisdom of his Father, shee the booke in which this word was written by th'-Abbreuiation of Incarnatiõ: He the Priest and Sacrifice, shee the Temple and Altar:

ex Dam. ser. de dorm. et par.

Preroga-tiues of our B. Ladie.

Hee the lamb of God, shee the Evve that eaned him: Hee the lion of the tribe of Iuda, shee the lioness that bare but once and but one, but that one a lion: He the sunne rising, shee the morning starre: he the sunne, she the moone that illuminated the Christian vvorld after the sunnes setting: He the sunne, she the vvoman clad vvith the sunne: To be breefe, Hee God and man, shee mother and virgin: he God, shee the mother of God: he the sonne, shee the mother: hee the King of heauen and earth, shee the queen mother: And although she, as being but a creature, vvas in natur infinitlie inferiour, yet in one respect shee is æqual vvith God the Father, bicause they are parentes of one sonne, though not in the same manner: and in another respect, shee vvas superiour to God the sonne, hee being the sonne, shee the mother: though he also in other respectes, euen as man, doth farre excell her. And so shee being next to God the Sonne in prærogatiues, must bee next him in vvorship and honour. And if shee, because she vvas the mother of God, may be honoured aboue the condition of a vvomã, vvhy shal not Saincts, bicause by grace they are the adopted sonnes, and freindes of God

Her honour.

God, next to him in glorie and blisse, and in that respect exalted aboue al temporal Potentates, be honoured aboue the condition of men and al temporal dignities? Certes the primatiue Church, thus vvorshipped them. *Iustinus Martyr*, saith that Christians vvorship God the Father, God the Sonne, and Angels. *S. Epiphanius* saith let *Marie be honoured, and let our lord be adored.* S. *Austin* saith, *Beatissimũ Petrum piscatorem modo genibus proiectis, adorat gentium multitudo: The multitude of nations vvith knees bowed to the ground, do adore* (that is vvorship) *most blessed Peter the Fisher.* And this they thought to be honourable to Christe also. *For*, saith saint Basil, *the honour vvhich vve giue to Saintes redoundeth to our common Lord. Vvhosoeuer* (saith saint Ambrose) *honoureth Martyrs, honoureth also Christe, and he that despiseth Saintes, despiseth our Lord. Leontius* in his Dialogue, rehearsed in the 7. Synod, subscribeth to these Fathers. This honour, though, as *saint Gregorie* of *Nisse* affirmeth, it bee greater then that vvhich is giuen to Emperours, yet is it not diuine honour, called *Latria* (for so to honour Saintes vvere idolatrie) as I haue declared: but is farre inferiour honour, called *Dulia*, vvhich either is a secõdarie act of *Religion*, vvhose part

Iustin. Apol. 2.

Epiph. hæres. 79.

Aug. ser. 2. de Pet. & Paulo.

Basil. orat. in 40. Mar.

Ambr. ser. 6.

7. Synod. act. 4.

Greg. Nissen. orat. in Theodor.

D.Th 2.2. q 81 a. 4 & q. 25. a 2 &q. 103. a 3 ad 2. Vasquez 1. de adorat.

is to honour God principally, and his Mother, and Saintes secondarily for his sake, or else it is an acte of the vertue called *obseruaunce*, vvhich reuerenceth them that are constituted in dignitie: as Saintes are, and especially the Mother of God: vvhose dignitie is supernatural: and so it farre surpassing al temporal dignitie, deserueth a greater honour then the ciuil vvorshipp vvhich vvee giue to Princes. This I haue explicated more at large in my Surucy.

Memories of Saintes.

5. Secondly modern Catholikes do erect Churches in memorie of Saintes: and so did the ancient Christians. *Constantine* the great vvas no soener Christian, but he applyed his mynde more to the building of Holy Churches, then sumptuous pallaces. He built Churches in the memorie of *saint Peter, saint Paul, saint Ihon*, and others: as *Eusebius* and *Anastasius* doe relate. Of this vse, *saint Athanasius, saint Ambrose, saint Basil, saint Gregorie Nazianzen, saint Gregorie* of *Nisse, saint Chrysostome*, S. *Hierom*, S. *Austin, saint Ciril*, S. *Ihon Damascen*, and S. *Gregorie* the *Great*, do make autentical mention, as also the Councel of Gangers, and Calcedon. I will only rehearse

Euseb. li de vit. Const. Anastas. Bibl. to. 1. Conc in Sylvestro. Ath. ep. ad solit. vit. agentes. Amb. l. 1. ep 5. Bas. in ps. 114.

Naz. orat. in Iul. Nis. orat. in Theod. Chrys. ho 18. ad pop & ho. 16. in ep 2. Cor. Hier. l. cont. Vigil. Aug. l de cura pro mortuis. c. 13. l 1 de ciu. c. 1 l. 22. ciu. c. 8. & 10 ep. 44 Cu cat. 16. Dam. l. 4. de fid. c. 16. Greg. l. 1. Dial. c. 8. Conc. Gangr. ep ad Episcopos. Arm. Conc. Calced.

S. *Austins* vvordes *l. 22. ciu. c. 10* bicause they, explicate also in vvhat sense vvee build Churches to Martyrs and Saintes. *Paganes* (saith he) *erected Temples and Aultars, and ordained Priests, and offred sacrifices, to their Goddes: Nos autem Martyribus nostris non Templa sicut dijs, &c. But vvee build not Temples to our Martyrs as to Goddes, but Memories as to dead men vvhose spirits liue vvith God: nether do vvee there erect Aultars in vvhich vvee may sacrifice to Martyrs: but vvee offer sacrifice to one God, the God of vs and Martyrs, at vvhich sacrifice, as men of God, vvho ouercame the vvorld in his confession, they are in their place and order named, but yet are not inuocated (to vvit by sacrifice) of the Priest, vvho sacrificeth: bicause he sacrificeth to God, not to them: because he is the Priest of God not of them. And the sacrifice is the body of Christe, vvhich is not offred to them, bicause they also are his body, to vvit, mystical.* Vvhat more playne? The like testimonie of the *memories*, and Churches of Martyrs, and of the sacrifice of Christians he hath in his eight booke of the *Citie* of God and 27. chapter. And in a sermon of S. *Peter*, and S. *Paule*, *Nunc ad memoriam Piscatoris, &c. nowu at the Church of the Fisher, the Emperours knees are bowed: there do glitter the pretious stones of the diadem, vvhere do shine the benefites of*

Reed. S. Austin. l. 20. cont. Faust. ma. c. 21.

Serm. 4. de Pet. & Paulo.

*the Fisher*: and then he concludeth: *Veneremur virgo*, &c. *Let vs vvorship therfore the Princes of our flocke, if vee vvil enter the sheepcoats of the Pastour.* And yet again: *Shevv me at Rome* (saith he) *the Temple of Romulus in so great honour, as I shevv to thee, the memorie* (that is the Church) *of Peter. In Peter vvho is honoured, but he that dyed for vs? for vvee are called Christians, not Petrians.* But lest th'infirme be here scandalized, they must note, that othervvise vvee erect Churches to God, othervvise to Saintes: to God principally, to Saintes secondarilie. Principally to God, bicause they are built principally to offer sacrifice, vvhich is only devv to God: for, as saint Austin saith, *quis verò*, &c. *Vvho did euer thinke that sacrifice vvas to be offered, but to him, vvhom he knevv, or famed to be God?* Secondarilie to Saintes, bicause the secondarie intētion of building Churches is, not only to meete at seruice, sermons and prayer, but also to commemorate the saintes names and heroical actes, and prayses, and to praye vnto them to assist vs by their Intercession: Hence they are called *memories*. And although some Churches beare the names of Saintes, yet that argueth not that they are builded principally for those Saintes honour: but only that amongst

Enarr. in ps. 44.

Hovv Churches are ereected to Saints.

l. 10. ciuit. c. 4.

al the Sainctes, these in that place are especially to bee remembred, and prayed vnto. And although in the Sacrifice of the Masse, the Priest maketh cõmemoration of them, and commiteth him selfe and the people to their prayers: yet he offereth no Sacrifice to them. for as the same *S. Austin* saith: *quis audiuit aliquando &c. vvho at any tyme hath hard the Priest standing at the Aultar though built ouer the holy sepulcre of the Martyr to God his honour and vvorshiip, to say: I offer to thee sacrifice, ô Peter, or Paule, or Ciprian, vvhen at their memories it is offered to God, vvho made them martyrs and men, and sociated them in heauenly honour vvith his holy angels.* l. 8. ciuit. c. 27.

5. Thirdly, as vve novv do, so did the first Christians, celebrate festiually the deathe-dayes of martyrs, vvhich they called their birth-dayes, bicause by death they vvere born to an immortal life. S. *Clement* the first Pope of Rome of that name and Coadiutor to S. *Peter*, maketh mention of the *feastes of th' Apostles*, S. *Stephen the prothomartyr*, *& other martyrs. Eusebius* relateth a letter written by the Church of *Smyrna*, in vvhich is described the stoute confession, and victorious death of *sainct Policarp* the martyr and Scholler of th' Apostles, and vvithall, that l. 8. const. Apost. c. 19. Holy dayes of Saintes.

Church there declareth, how they gathered vp his bones which the fire had not quite consumed, and buried them. *In which place* (say they) *etiam nunc præstante domino solemnes agimus &c. euen now, wee make solemne and celebre meetinges, especially in the daye of his Passion, as also when wee celebrate the memories of them that had suffred before: that the myndes of those that followe, may be stirred vp by their examples.* Tertulian also mentioneth the same custome in his tyme: *wee make oblations*, saith he, *for Byrth dayes, on the anniuersarie day.* for although *Rhenanus* imagineth, that *Tertulian* speaketh of celebrating byrthdayes after the māner of the Ethnikes, yet *Pamelius* proueth that he meaneth the martyrs death dayes, in which they were borne to the next life, and which dayes were kept holy and celebrated with ioye. The same *Tertulian* alluding to the same thing, saith, *habes tuos censes, tuos fastos, thou hast thy valuations, and thy Calenders of sainctes dayes.* And although the *Magdeburgians* would persuade vs that these oblations on the feastes of martyrs, were brought in by the *Montanists*, yet it is certain that *Tertulian* meaneth the oblations of the true Christians, because in that third chapter, he reckeneth vp ancient customes and

et Euseb. l. 4. c. 15.

Tert. l. de Coron. mil. c. 3.

Pamel. in Anot. n. 37. et in ep 34. Cypr. n. 14.

Cap. 13.

traditions of the Christians Church, vvhich names could not then aggree to the newv deuises of the *Montanists* S. *Ciprian* also exhorteth the Clergie of *Carthage* to note diligently in Ecclesiastical Tables, the dayes in vvhich martyrs dyed, *vt commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus*, *that vvee may celebrate theyr commemorations, among the memories of martyrs.* *Origen* saith, *that the holy fathers did vvel and according to God his vvil to cõmand, to celebrate in Churches the sempiternal memorie of the Innocents, as of those that dyed for our lord.* S. *Austin*, vvith vvhom I wil end, speaketh as plainly as any modern Papist can doe. *Populus autem Christianus memorias martyrũ religiosa solennitate concelebrat &c.* *the Christian people doth celebrate the memories of martyrs vvith a religious solennitie, to stirre vp imitation, and to be consociated to their merit, and to be helped by their prayers, yet so that vve erect Aultars to no martyr, but only to the God of martyrs, although in memories of martyrs.* ep. 37. Orig. ho. 3 in mat. de Infant. Innocent. 20. cont. Faust. mã. c. 21.

6. The Catholiques of this age do deuoutly visit Christes and sainctes Tombes, and do reuerence their Reliques: so did the ancient Christians. And to omit that *Ecclesiasticus* testifieth that *Ioseph's bones vvere visited, and did prophecie after death*, that is, vvrought Pilgimage. Eccl. 49.

racles vvhich proued him a prophet of God and a great saint to them that visited them. S. *Hierom* saith, that to his tyme, *Iosephs sepulchre* vvas had in veneratiō. S. *Dorotheus* Bishop of *Tyrus*, testifieth the same of S. *Hieremies* monumēt. S. *Austin*, saith that the Emperour supplicateth at the sepulchre of the Fisher Peter. *Ruffinus* relateth how the Emperour *Theodosius*, before he vvas to bid battaile, visited the places of prayer, and *prostrated him selfe in heare cloth before the Reliquiaries or Chestes of Martyrs*, and Apostles Reliques. S. *Chrysostome* telles, vs that *Christes sepulchre, is more venerable and glorious then a thousand Kinges pallaces, yea then the Kinges, them selues.* for this deuotion, many of our ancient and glorious Kinges of our countrie are famous, as *Ceadvval* King of the vvest Saxons, vvho vvent on Pilgrimage to Rome to visit the sepulchres of the Apostles, and there dyed about the yeare 690. *Ina* also his successor (vvho builded the Schoole in which the Inglish studentes in Rome ate novv trained vp in all learning and pietie) imitated his example, and dyed there also about the yeare 728. *Offa* King of th'East Saxons, & Chenredus King of the *Mercians*, hauing finished the same Pilgrimage entred the order of S.

Hieron. in cap 1. Oseæ, Ioan, et Abdiæ.

Doroth. in Synopsi.

Aug. ep. 42.

Ruff. l. 2. Hist. cap. 33.

Chrysost. demonst. quod Christus sit Deus.

Paulus. Diac. l. 6. cap. 4. de gestis longo bard.

Polid. virg l. 4 et 5.

Greg. Tur. Ammonius.

*Benedict.* And after that Ingland became to bee a monarchie, *Ethelulphus* and *Canutus*, visited the sepulchres of the Apostles at Rome and retourned: the like deuotion *Clodoueus*, *Pipinus*, *Charles the great*, *Pipinus* his sonne, *S. Lewis*, and other Kinges of Fraunce, haue left to Posteritie. And *vvho soeuer*, saith S. *Hierom*, *is cheefest in Fraunce*, *maketh hast hether* (to Hierusalem) *the Brittain* (novv Inglish) *deuided from the vvorld*, *if he haue proceeded in Religion*, *leauing the going down sunne*, *seeketh this place*, *vvhich to him is knovvn only by fame and Relation of scriptures.* S. *Ambrose preuenting our heretikes obiections*, saieth: *but if thou demaund*, *vvhat honoureſt thou in flesh novv resolued and consumed? I honour in the flesh of martyrs*, *the vvoundes receued for Christes name. I honour the memorie of the liuing by perpetuitie of vertue*; *I honour the ashes sacred by the Confession of our lord: I honour in ashes*, *the seedes of æternitie: I honour the body which teacheth me to loue my lord and not to feare death for him. And vvhy should not the faithful honour that body*, *vvhich euen the deuils do feare?* &c. *S. Austin* saith, that who so beleeueth not that Saincktes bodyes and especially martyrs Reliques are to bee honoured and their Churches to be visited, *he is no Christian*, *but an Eunomian and vigilātian.*

Heron. ep. 17. cap. 6.

Ambr. ser. 93. de SS. Nazar. et Celso.

honour of Reliques.

Aug. to. 3 de Eccles. dogm. ca. 73.

Chryſ ſer. de ſs. Ineuento et martmo. *Let vs therfore often tyme*, ſaith *S. Chryſoſtome*, viſit Sainctes *let vs adore their ſepulchres, and vvith great faith let vs touch their Reliques that from thence vvee may obtein ſame benediction.* S.

Aug. l. 22. ciuit. c. 8. *Auſtin* recounteth *many miracles vvrought by Sainctes bodyes and Reliques. ſainct Chryſoſtome*

Chryſ. ſer. 32. in ep. ad Rom. vvould ſeem to our nevv Chriſtians to dote on the Reliques of *ſainct Paule*: who deſireth to be faſtened to his ſepulchre, to ſee the duſt of that body, that bare the markes of

S. Chriſ. deuotiõ to Reliques. „ Chriſte: of that mouth which was the trom-
„ pet of Chriſte: of that hart, vvhich vvas the
„ hart and beginning of life of the vvorld: of
„ thoſe handes vvhich vvere manicled for
„ Chriſte, which by impoſition gaue the holy
„ Ghoſt, which vvrote ſo many holy Epiſtles,
„ vvhich the vipers could not ſtinge: of thoſe
„ eyes, vvhich being blinded from aboue,
„ vvere opened to illuminat the vvorld, which
„ had ſeen Chriſte, and thinges not to be ſpo-
„ ken of, and vvhich vvatched at midnight: of
thoſe feet, vvhich trauerſed the vvorld for the conuerſion of ſoules, vvhich vvere tyed for Chriſte, and which made ſo many voya-

Mat. 9. ges for the ſaluation of others. And this practiſe begã euen in Chriſtes and th' Apoſtles tymes. for, the vvoman that touched vvith ſuch faith and deuotiõ the hemme of Chri-

ſhes garment, vvas recompenſed vvith a miraculous cure. Thoſe Chriſtians deuotion towardes the *Napkins* and *hand Kercheefs* that had touched *ſainct Paules* body, and towarde *ſainct Peters ſhadovv*, had as many revvardes as miracles. And before them, if vvee beleue *S. Hierom the Ievves vvorſhiped their ſanctum ſanctorum, becauſe therin vvere the Cherubins, the propitiatorie, the Arke of the Teſtament, Manna, the rod of Aaron, and the golden Altar.*

Act. 19.

Act. 5.

Hieron. ep. 17. ad Marcel.

8. Catholiques pray to Saintes: ſo did the faithful euer. Iacob prayed to his *guardian Angel*, to bleſſe his childrē, and demaundeth that his ovvn name, and the name of his father be called on for them. Eliphas biddes Iob to turn him ſelfe for helpe, *to ſome of the Saintes*: the Ievves prayed to God to heare them, for *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, *Iacob*, and *Dauids* ſake. God him ſelfe ſaith that although *Moyſes* and *Samuel*, *ſhould ſtand before him* for the people, that had offended him, *his hart ſhould not be vvith them*, that is, he vvil not heare and helpe them, vvhich manner of ſpeach argueth, that the dead might haue prayed for thē, whatſoeuer *Caluin* Cauileth. *Iudas Machabeus* ſavv in a viſion, *Onias* and *Hieremie* praying for the people: vvhich viſion vvith the booke it ſelfe, *Luther* once ad-

prayer to Saincts.

Gen. 48.

Iob. 5.

Aug. in ca. 19. Iob.

Tho. in c. 5. Iob.

ex. 32. Pſ. 131. Dan. 3.

Ierem. 5.

l. 3. Inſt. c. 20. §. 23.

2. Mac 15.

Luth præfat. lib. 1. Mac. et Aug. l. de cura pro mort. et l. 18. ciuit. ca 3. Tob 12. Aug. l. 7. de bap. cont. Don c. 1. Hiero. in vita Paulæ. Leo. ser. 3. de Anniuers. et ser. 1. de Sa. Petro et Paulo. Theod l. 8. ad Græcos. Naz. orat. 14. Hier. l. cõt vigilant. 1. Reg. 7. Iob. 42. Rom. 15. Thes. 3. Hebr. 5. et vlt. Iac. 5.

mitted, and so doth S. *Austin*. *Raphael* also offred vp *Tobias* his prayers. And the most ancient and best Christians haue prayed to Saintes: as S. *Austin* prayed to S. *Cyprian*, S. *Hierom*, to S. *Paula*, S. *Leo*, to S. *Peter*. *Theodoret* saith, that they that make great iorneyes, vse to desire the martyrs to be their guides. S. *Gregorie* of *Nazianze* saith, that his father *Gregorie*, Helpes more by his prayers, then he did in his life tyme, by his preaching. S. *Hierom* saith, if *Moyses* and *S. Stephen* prayed for others in this life, shal they nowe be lesse able being with Christe? And seing wee may pray to the Saintes liuing in this life, (as we haue many examples to warrant vs) why may wee not pray to the Saintes dead to this world, but liuing in heauen? whereas *Sotcliff* saith, that Saintes knowe not our cogitations and prayers, and addeth that I make them Goddes, in saying they knowe the, he sheweth his wit: bicause though God, only of him selfe knowe our cogitations, yet Saintes and Prophets may by reuelation. So *Helizeus* knew *Giezies* simonie, 4. *Reg.* 5. and what was done in the King of *Syria* his campe: 4. *Reg.* 6. And Christe *Luc.* 15. saith that Angels reioice at the conuersion of a sinner, which is the greatest secret of his harte, and

consequently knovv it, and yet are no Goddes. And so may Saintes ether by a distinct reuelation from the clear vision of Goddes essence, or by the vision it selfe, knovv the prayers that are made vnto them. And therfore S. *Gregorie* saith, *quid est quod ibi nesciunt, vbi scientem omnia sciunt? What is it, that there they knovv not, vvhere they knovv him that knovveth al?* nether is this to comprehend God, as our Deane vveeneth, bicause they know not al thinges in God, but those only which belong to their state, as prayers made vnto them, doe. Hence I deduce this argument. If it be vnlavvful to pray to Saintes; ether it is, bicause it derogateth to Christe, or bicause they knovv not what we say. not for the first, bicause vvee pray to Saintes of this life as secondarie intercessors, and yet derogate not to Christe. not for the second, bicause I haue proued they heare vs. And if for the one or other *Sotcliff* condemne this prayer, he condemneth scriptures, and al the best Christians, that allovv it.

Greg. l. 4. Dial. cap. 33. Bern. lib. de consid. in initio. Tho. 1. p. q. 12. a. 8.

9. Catholiques vse to erect Images of Saintes to cal to minde the saintes examples, and to honour them in honouring their Images: so did the most ancient Christians as a boue fol. 124. I haue proued. But *Luther*

Images.

aboue fol. 124.

Luth. in Colloq. mensal. tit de Impugnat. Codeus in Act. Luth. an. 1546. in fine.

might say, *sancte Satan ora pro me*, holy Satan *pray for mee*: and he might say to his freindes standing by at his death, *orate pro Domino nostro Deo, et eius Euangelio*, *pray for our lord God and for his Ghospel*: and yet in vs, it must be condemned, that vvee pray the Mother of God and his Saincts to be intercessors for vs. I had proued al these thinges before in this chapter of my *Survey*: for from the page 339. to 342. I haue proued them by the nature of frendship: and from the page 348. to 355. I haue shevved hovv honoring of Saintes importeth no Idolatrie but honour to Christe; and frō the page 355. to 357. I haue proued by scripture, that Saintes may be prayed vnto and that they and their Images, and Reliques, are to be honoured and respected: and in my second edition I haue confirmed al this by Fathers: And yet our Minister, because his face is of Brasse, blusheth not to say: *If Kel. were the man he would be taken for*, he should leaue his *vagrant Scrueing discourses* (so he calles them) *and proue the same by arguments*. By vvhich vvee see how like he is the man he is taken for, that is bold and impudent. yet this he was forced to say, that the Reader should not meruail, that he answvered nothing, he hauing nothing to

answer. But if not by those proofes, at least by these and those, our minister may see, that wee the Catholikes of this tyme, worship Saintes, and their images, reliques, and pray to them in heauē, no otherwise then the ancient Christians haue euer done: and so if they in this were not superstitious, nether are wee: And if the Image breakers of whō I haue spoken aboue, were iustly condemned as traytours to Christe, for denying honour to his saintes and breaking and defacing their Images: then are *Sotcliffes* ministers guiltie of the same crime, who haue exceeded them in that kinde, as aboue also wee haue seen: and as appeareth by their burning of S. Thomas of Canterburies and other sainctes bones in England by the like vsage of the Reliques of *S. Hilare* at *Poicters*, of *S. Ireneus at Lions*, of *S. Martin at Tours*, by their defacing the Images of Christe and Sainctes in *sainct Medardes* Church in the Faulxburgs of *sainct Marcel* by Paris: where a Captain riding to the high Aultar, cryed, *pillez tout compaignons*: by their setting fier vppon the Church at Orleans called *l'Eglise sainct Croix*, and their burning of the Reliques of *sainct Aignan*: and yet in the places where they committed this insolent sacri-

fol. 135.

fol. 1, 6. pag. 1.

Surius an. 1562.

ex Martino del Rio l. 3. disquis. magic. pag. 197. sec. 1. supra fol. 136 pag. 1. In vie de Caluin ca. 12. ex Caluino turc. l. 2. c. 18.

lege, they spared the pictur of the deuil (as aboue vvee haue seen), and so shevv no thing but hatred to Christe, and loue only to the deuil: and *Caluin*, who (when he vvas told that diuers simple folkes for respect did vveare his Image about their neckes) bad them pul out their eyes if such a spectacle displeased them, seemeth to esteem mote of him selfe then of the sainctes or mother of Christe, yea or of Christe him selfe, because the natur of frendship (as in my Surucy I haue at large declared) is such, that if vvee respect Christe wee must respect his mother his sainctes their Images and Reliques, and if vvee reuile the sainctes or deny them honour, if wee deface their Images and burne their bodyes, vvee are conuinced to beare no reuerence nor loue to Christe, as a plain example brought by me in the end of this chapter proueth, and soe cõuincethalso, that our Ministers durst not so much as mention it.

the conclusion.

10. And thus hauing proued al, vvhervvith I haue charged the Reformers, it followeth euidently, that their Religion is Antichristian, being so iniurious to Christe, and they them selues præcursors of Antichrist, vvho haue set such doctrine a broach and

and therfore, that cõclusion of *Sotcliff*: *Thus vve see our doctrin, concerning Christes person and his cure, cleared*: is but a meare bragge of a man ouercome, after that his conquerour hath left him, sprawling on the ground. And therfore becauſe he ſeeth him ſelfe, that he hath not been able to cleare his own doctrin from *Antichriſtianiſme*, he ſeekes novv to proue our doctrin alſo to be Antichriſtian, that ſo he may confort him ſelfe vvith companions in miſerie: and this, he preſumeth, he ſhal proue ſo euidently, *that nether Kellison, nor al his conſortes ſhal be able to cleare or defend*. This he endeuoureth to proue in the 6. *Chapter*, which I ſhal put vnder the name of an Appendix, it being no part of the anſvver to my Suruey.

# AN ANSVVER TO SOTcliffes *Appendix*, in vvhich he ſurueyeth Catholikes doctrine concerning Chriſt.

## Sotcliff. Chap. 6.

*A Collection of certain abſurd and blaſphemous aſſertions of the Papiſtes, concerning Chriſtes Incarnation, Perſon, natures, and offices.*

### Kellison.

THis Miniſter hauing experienced hovv impoſſible it vvas for him to cleare his former doctrin (as hovv ſhould he defend an euil cauſe that cā not defend a good?) makes novv a Suruey of Catholikes doctrine; hopig to haue better ſucceſs in impugning then in defending, and to proue our doctrine, as I haue proued his, Anti-chriſtian. But vvheras I Surueyed their Religion and faith, vvhich ether they al or at leaſt their cheefe founders do imbrace, he hath only made a collection of certain opinions of Schoole diuines vvhich are not matters of faith amongeſt vs: vvherin, as he contrarieth his ovvn promiſe in his Epiſtle to the Reader before his Sottiſh Sur-

uey (vvhere he ſaith *he doth not obiect vvhat Scotus, Aquinas, Durand, Biel, Stapleton, Harding, Bellarmin, do teach, but vvhat is defined by ſome Councel or Pope, or generally receiued amongeſt them*, and yet both there and here, he Surueyeth only Schoole pointes or manners and abuſes) ſo he medleth in matters, vvhich ether he neuer read in the Schoole men themſelues, but tooke them of credit from *Iewel* or ſome other, and therfore diuers tymes imputes things to them vvhich they neuer ſayd: or at leaſt he vnderſtood them not, and therfore alleageth opinions in vvhich is no abſurditie, or at leaſt no hereſie contrarie to Chriſte or any article of faith: but let vs ſee his ſtuffe.

## Sotcliff.

1. *Firſt then Alexander Hales p. 3. q. 2. membr. 13. ſayth that although man had not fallen yet Chriſte ſhould haue been Incarnate. &c.*

## Kellison.

VVe hold all (Sir Mathevv) that Chriſte hath taken fleſh to redeem vs, from ſinne: vvhich only Scripture expreſſely affirmeth: but vvhether that he vvould haue taken fleſh if *Adam* had not ſinned, that is curiouſly diſputed amongeſt Schoole men. And the *Thomiſts* hold that he vvould not, vvhich ſeemeth moſt conformable to Scriptures and Fathers, vvho aſſigning the cauſe of the ſonne of Gods Incarnation, men-

3. p. q. 1. a. 3. Caiet. ibid. Med. ibid.

Scot. in 3. d. 7. q. 3. et d. 19 §. in ista quæst.

tion only sinne: but the *Scotists* hold that though *Adam* had not sinned, yet God would haue been Incarnate, so to communicate him selfe, and to exalte our natur. And to the Scripturs and Fathers which say, that God was Incarnate and tooke flesh to expiate sinne, & else had not been Incarnate: They answer, that those places only teach, that God had neuer been Incarnate in a passible body, nether in it had dyed, if sinne had not been, but deny not that he would haue come in impassible flesh, though Adame had neuer transgressed. And so here is no blasphemie *against Christes Incarnatiõ, persons, natures or offices:* nether doth any of these *opinions crosse Christes Counsels, make man wiser then God, or contradict Scriptures or Fathers*, expressely.

## Sotcliff.

2. *The same Alexander and Vdalricus do affirm that the 3. persons in the Trinity may assume one mans natur &c. but this is contrarie to the works of th' Incarnation of Christe, and confoundeth the persons, and is a thing not imaginable.*

## Kellison.

Tho. 3. p. q. 3. a. 6. Scot. in 3. d. 1. q. 2. § ad quæst. 3g cur.

2. HE might haue added *S. Thomas* also of *Aquin*, and almost al the *Thomists*, who hold the same, though *Scotus* and his followers do deny it to be possible that 3. persons should assume one indiuidual natur of a man. And the Church permitteth them both to abound in yᵗ

ſenſe they will, bicauſe they al hold that *de facto*, the ſecond perſon only hath aſſumed our natur. And therfore vvheras, *Sotcliff* ſaith, that this is *contrarie to the vvorke of th'Incarnation of Chriſte, and confoundeth the perſons, and is not a thing imaginable:* In the firſt he ſhevveth his vvit, that could not diſtinguiſh *factum* and *poſſible*, to vvit, that vvhich is, and that vvhich might bee. for they al confeſſ that the ſecond perſon only hath aſſumed humain natur, and ſo *croſſe not the vvorke of th'Incarnation*: yet they ſay that al 3. perſons might haue taken the ſame natur vvhich God the ſonne did. In the ſecond he rather confoundeth him ſelfe, bicauſe as in the three perſons is one diuine natur vvithout confuſion of perſons, ſo might they haue aſſumed one humain natur, and ſo ſhould then haue been one man, as novv they are one God, vvithout al confuſion of perſons. In the third he imagineth him ſelfe vviſer then *Saint Thomas* of *Aquin* vvho could imagin it: but I thinke in deed *Sotcliff* vnderſtandeth not the thing, and ſo can nether imagin th'one nor th'other. But let vs leaue here our Miniſter amongeſt the *Scotiſts*, vvho in the former aſſertion vvould needs be a Thomiſt: and ſo lack on both ſides.

## Sotcliff.

3. THirdly *Thomas, in Scripto*, and durand in 3. d. 2. q. 1. *and others, do ſay, that God vvas able to aſſume an vnreaſonable creatur. But vvhat is more blaſphemous then to cal God a Horſe?* &c.

CErtes if God could not haue assumed an vnreasonable creatur, he could neuer haue assumed your vvorship: and so in this you haue made an ill Choise. and to your ovvn preiudice you hold vvith *Alexander* of *Hales* and others, vvhom before you reiected, and are departed from *S. Thomas* of *Aquin* (vvhom you alleage, to the contrarie but quote not the place) and the common opinion of *Thomists* and *Scotists*. So that novv you are nether *Thomist* nor *Scotist*, vvho before vvere both. Vvheras you adde, that this is blasphemous, I deny your assumption. For although if God had assumed the natur of a Tree or a horse, hee might haue truly been called a tree or a horse by communication of Idiomes, euen as vvhen he vvas first Incarnate, he vvas truly called a mortal man, yea a childe also: as this importeth no blasphemie nor indignitie in God, so nether should that. yet I graunt, that as although God bee in al places vvithout any hurt to his diuinitie, yet al the places are not to be named of vs, bicause the naming vvould seem to vs to import an irreuerence: so if God had (as he did not) assumed some vnreasonable creatur, though it could not haue præiudiced his diuinitie, yet al the denominations vvhich thence had followed had not to haue been vsed of vs. But *S. Thomas*, and diuines, distinguish betvvixt that vvhich might haue been, vvas conuenient to be, and vvas necessarie to bee. God then might haue taken an vnreasona-

Alex 3 pa. q. 2. m. 7. et q. 11. m. 1. et q. 12. m. 1. a 2. Henr. quod l. 13. q. 5. Picus Mirandula in Apol. cone. 4. Th. in 3. d. 2. q. 1. Scot in 3. d. 2. q. 1. a. 2. Caiet. med. Suarez 3. p. q. 4. a 1.

ble natur, as he tooke our body, vvhich is vnreasonable, and continued the Assumption of it, vvhen it vvas separated from the soule by death: but it vvas not conuenient, in respect that it is vnreasonable: and it could not haue serued God to that end for vvhich he tooke mans natur, bicause in that he could nether haue merited nor satisfied. he might also haue taken an Angels natur, but that vvas not necessarie, because the good Angels being neuer infected vvith sinne, had noe need therof; th'euil Angels had need, but vvere not to bee holpen, by reason of their obstinacie. Mannes nature only vvas most conuenientlie assumpted bicause that natur vvas fallen & so needed to be eleuated, that vvas not irremediable as the euil Angels vvere, & so might be repaired, that vvas an abridgement and a litle vvorld of al thinges, and so in it, God communicated him selfe to al creaturs: vvhich he could not haue done in assuming an Angels natur: that beareth the Image of God, and could merit and satisfie, vvheras an vnreasonable nature, hath nether of these perfections.

## Sotcliffe.

1. *Bonauentur in 3. d. 4. sayth the Virgin Marie hath destroyed al hereses and did merit the Reconciliation of al mankind &c.*

## Kellison.

And seemeth this so hard a speech to your delicate eares? *S. Athanasius, S Hierom,* or *S.* Ath. ser. de sanct. Deipa. Hier. ſc

de Annūc. Bern ser. Signum magnum. Rup. l. 1. in cant.

*phronius*, and *S. Bernard* and *Rupertus*, affirme the same, giuing her the Title of *omnium hæresum interemptrix*: and the Church singeth and singing, confesseth, that *she hath killed al heresies in the whole world. But them* (sayth *Sotc:*) *she was a more excellent teacher then the Apostles*. So was she in some sorte.

Anselm. l. de Excel. Virg. cap. 7. Ignat. ep. Rup. supra.

And therfore some Fathers call her *the Maistresse of th' Apostles*. for she being taught more by the Holy Ghost then they, (as being the mother of God) more frequently illuminated by Angels, more familiar with Christe in al his life then they, more beloued of him thē they, taught them many thinges after Christes Ascension: and so shee was the Maistresse of the world and refuted al heresies not only in that she bare Christe the Doctour of the world, but also bicause she reuealed many thinges to the Apostles, which they preached and deliuered to the world, and she assisted them and al the Doctours of the Church by her prayers, yea though she neuer preached, as being a woman, yet she was indewed (as being the mother of God) with more knowledge of diuine mysteries then they. And no meruail. for shee was the booke in which the Word of God was written by abreuiation of th' Incarnatiō, and she was th' Academie in which the *wisdome of God* resided.

Hom. super cap. 10. Euang. Luc.

whence *S. Anselm* makes this deduction: *Christ was he, in whom were al the treasurs of the wisdom and knowledge of God, and Christe was in Marie, and cōsequently al the treasurs of science and knowledge, were in Marie.* Whereas *Sotc.* addeth that *S. Bonauenture* sayth, this B. Virgin merited the reconciliation of

al mankind, I answer that the diuines commonly do hold, that she merited not the substaunce of th'Incarnation, nether could, that being the source of al merit: only they say that both shee and the Saincles of th'old lavve, merited *de congruo*, not *de condigno*, the circumstaunces of th'Incarnation. those Fathers merited not, that God should bee Incarnate, but Supposing God had of his meare mercie resolued to take flesh, they by their prayers deserued, that it should be taken of their nation, and that it should not be differred so long as othervvise it might haue been: The Sacred virgin deserued that it should be taken of Her. And therfore *Venantius* sayth:

Th. 3. par. q. 2. a. 11. et alij ibid et in 2. d. 4. Alex. de Hales 3. par.

Isa. 41.

Venant. l. de æternis gaudijs

*Virginitas fœlix, quæ partus est digna Tonantis*
*Quæ meruit dominum progenerare suum.*

Happie virginitie, thought vvorthie to bring forthe,
The Thunderer, and to conceue, & beare her lord by vvorth.

*S. Ambrose* saith *shee vvas vvorthy that the Sonne of God should bee born of Her*. *Epiphanius* auerreth, *that she vvas vvorthy to be the Habitacle of the Sonne of God*. And this only *Bonauentur* meant, vvhen he sayed she merited *de digno* not *de condigno*, to be the mother of God. But if he or any other should hold that she merited mans reconciliation, yet thence it followeth nor, as *Soto*. thinketh, that Christes merites vvere not needfull: bicause they might mean only, that shee merited, our reconciliation bicause in meriting to be the mother of God, she merited th'Incarnation, vvhich is our only recon-

Ambr l. 2. de virgin. Epiph. her. 98.

cilliation. but as I sayd, the common opiniō is, that she merited not the substaunce of th'Incarnation, but only the circunstaunces of it.

## Sotcliff.

5. Vdalricus l. 5 sum. denyeth that Christ hath 2. relations of a sonne &c. veneramur (saith he) *in Christo duas natiuitates non duas filiationes.*

## Kellison.

Th 3. p. q. 35. a. 5. Bonau. in 3 d. 8.

YOu might haue added also *S. Thomas* of *Aquin* and *S. Bonauētur* and others: vvho though they affirme Christe to be truly the sonne of God the Father, and of the B. virgin also his mother, and so to be tvvise borne: once before al Worldes, vvithout a mother, of the fertil vvomb of his Fathers diuinitie: and once again in tyme, of his mother, vvithout a father, of the chast vvomb of his virgin-mother: yet they say, there are not tvvoe real relations of filiation: bicause there are not tvvoe

in 3. d. 4. persons in Christe. But *Scotus*, *Richardus*, *durand*, and others (vvith vvhom *Sotcliff* holdeth by chaunce rather then Iudgemēt) affirme that in Christe are also tvvoe relatiōs of filiations, as there are tvvoe natures and natiuities. Vvherfore seing *Sotc.* vvil be a *Scotist*, I vvil propose him one only argument of the Thomists, vvhich I thinke his Philosophie vvil not answer: *Filation is that vvhich formallie maketh a sonne, but ther are, according to our Scotist Sotcliff, tvvoe filiations in Christe, ergo tvvoe sonnes*, and conse-

quently tvvoe persons, and so *Sotcliff* falleth into *Nestorianism*. But to help him out the of the Briars, I vvil answver, that though there bee tvvoe filiations in Christe, yet there are not tvvoe sonnes, bicause diuers filiations, make not alvvayes diuers sonnes, but only, Vvhen they are in diuers persons; euen as diuers artes in one man make not diuers artificers, but only in diuers men: and diuers relations of paternities in one father, make not diuers Fathers. But *Sotcliff* obiecteth against *S. Thomas* also, that if there bee not tvvoe real relatiõs of filiation, then Christe as man, is not really the sonne of the B. Virgin. I answver him, that it is sufficient to make Christe really the sonne of the Virgin, that she really gaue him flesh and boare him, though she could not giue him a real relation of filation, bicause he had noe humain person. So that vvhat soeuer opinion of these tvvoe, a man follovv, he can not be an heretike, bicause both opinions hold Christe to betruly the sonne of the B. Virgin.

## Sotcliff.

6. *Alexander Hales granteth that this proposition, Christ as he is man, is th'adopted sonne of God, is true &c.*

## Kellison.

*Sotcliff* neuer read *Alexander* of *Hales* and therfore speakes but byguesse. this I gather by tvvoe good signes the one, bicause he quoteth

Alex 3 pa. q.1.m.3.a. 4. not the place. the other, bicause *Alexander* of *Hales* teacheth clean contrarie. for he only saith that Christe as man is the sonne of God by creation, in vvhich sence God is called in scriptur the Father of rayn and al creaturs: yea that as man heo is the sonne of God by grace, bicause as man he vvas repleniſhed vvith grace: but he flatly denyeth him euen as man to be th'adopted sonne of God: and good reason. bicause adoption, is of an extraneau perſō, Christe is a diuine perſon, vvch is the sonne of God by natur & æternal natiuitie. yet I graunt that *Durand.* and *Basolis* do teach, that though Christe absolutly is not to be called the Adoptiue sonne of God, yet vvith this additiō as, man, he may so be called, bicause as mā, he procedes not frō God the Father by æternal generation. vvhich reason *Sotc.* vvould not so easilie answer.

Tho. 3 pa q. 23. a. 4. et q. 32. a. 3. et q 43. a. 1. et l. 4. cōt. gent. c. 10. Magister in 3 d. 10. et Schol. ibid. But not vvithstanding this, the cōmon opinion of diuines is, that Christe euen as man, is not to be called the Adoptiue sonne of God: bicause adoption is not of the natur but of the perſon, vvhich in Christe is the second perſon in Trinitie and the natural sonne of God: and that man Christe is a diuine perſon, and the sonne of God by æternal, of the virgin, by temporal generation, the natural sonne of both, the adopted of nether.

## Sotcliff.

7. *Durand in 3 sent. d. 11. admitteth this proposition, Christe is a creatur, vvhich cōmeth neere to Arrianism.* &c.

KELLISON.

OVr Miniſter had vvatched to long at tables or vndeſtood not *Durand*, or tooke his obiections for his concluſion, vvhen he thus alleaged *Durand*. for *Durand* plainly reiecteth that propoſition. he confeſſeth in deed, that amongeſt true Chriſtians, there is no doubt of the thing, all graunting againſt infidels and Arrians, that Chriſt is God, and that his perſon is diuine and increate, though his humanitie create and limited: yet ſaith hee, the queſtion is about the manner of ſpeech, vvhether, Chriſte in reſpect of his humain natur may bee called a creatur: and ſaith hee, *tenetur communiter quod non, niſi cum iſta additione in quantum homo, commonly it is holden that noe, vnleſſe vvith this addition, as man.* And then anſvvering to the Fathers, vvho ſome of them cal Chriſte a creatur, ſome of them deny that manner of ſpeech, he ſaith, the former graunt that ſpeech vvith that addition, *as man*, the others deny it in *th' Arrians* ſenſe. The ſame ſaith *S Thomas* of *Aquin*. And certes it can not be denyed, but that if vvee vnderſtand by Chriſte, not his diuine perſon, but that cõpound of the diuine perſon and humain natur called Chriſte, ſubſiſting in tvvoe naturs: then Chriſt is a thing temporal and produced in tyme, vvhich vvas not before th'Incarnation. for although the diuine and ſecond perſon vvas æternal, yet that only is not Chriſte. and ſo Chriſte compoſed of the diuine perſon and humain natur, vvas not before his Mother. and therfore *Ieremie* ſaith, that vvhen by Incarnation *a vvoman compaſſed a man,*

Dur. in 3. d. 11. q. 1. n. 11.

1 par. q. 16 a. 8. in corp.

Suarez 3. 3. p. diſp. 7. ſect. 5.

Ier. 31.

*God created a newe thing on earth:* Yet such a thing, as the worke was æqual to the worker. And in this sense *S. Gregorie Nazienzen* cryeth out in admiration: *O nouam mixtionem &c. O newe mixture and meruailous temperatur, he that is, is made, and he that is not created, is created.* bicause although the diuine person of Christ bee increated, yet that mixtion and compound of the diuine person and humain natur was not before *Marie*. Secondly diuines say, that as Christe as man, is truly born of the virgin Marie, and was not before her; so as man hee is a creatur, bicause the natur of man doth imply essentiallie that imperfection. and in this sense *S. Austin* saith: *quantum ad verbum attinet Creatus est Christus, quantum vero ad hominem, creatura est Christus: in respect of the word æternal, Christe is Creatour, in respect of his humain natur, he is a creature.* And to say that Christe as man is a Creatur, is no more derogatorie, then to say that Christe as man was mortal, suffred, dyed, which al argued a creatr and passible natur. The question amongest diuines only is, whether without al addition, wee may say as properlie *Christe is a creatur*, as wee may say, Christe is a man. And some say that wee can not so say without addition or explication, bicause the word Christe *Supponit pro persona, supposeth for the person of Christe*, which is increate. to whom *Durand* subscribeth. but *Durand* giues this reason, bicause saith hee, a creatur is that which is produced of nothing, Christe is not produced of nothing, becaus his diuine person was before Incarnation. yet others say, that Christe by commu-

Greg. orat. 34.

Aug ep. 57.

Magist. Tho. capr. Pal. Dur. in 3. d. 11.

Scot. Bonau. in 3. d. 11. Tho. Vvald. li. 1. doctr. fid. c. 41. Sua 1ª 2. supra.

nication of Idioms may trulie and absolutly bee called creature: bicause not only that vvhich is produced of nothing is called creature, but also vvhat soeuer is produced in tyme and hath limited and create nature: in vvhich sense man is a creature, and yet produced of the fovvre elemẽtes. for say they, vvhat soeuer aggreeth essentiallie or necessarilie to Christe as man, may be absolutely pronounced of him: for as you may say vvith addition, *Christe as man vvas born of the virgin, and dyed:* so you may say absolutelie, Christe was born of the virgin, and dyed: and therfore seing that vve may say, Christe as man is a creatur, vvee may say absolutely, Christe is a creatur, by *communication of Idioms.* But as *Sainct Thomas* aduertisseth vs, though vvee may trulie say Ghriste is a creatur, meaning as man, yet such speeches are not to be vsed, vvithout explication, not bicause they are false, but because they may bee offensiue, and seem to fauour *th' Arrians.*

SOTCLIFE.

8. *Bonauentur in 3. d. 12. confesseth that in Christe there vvas a povver to sinne &c.*

KELLISON.

HEre also our Dean vvanted his spectacles. For S. Bonauẽtur expresselie saith, that Christe euen as man could not possiblie sinne: vvhich is the cõmon opinion of al diuines. only he saith that Christe had that faculties and povver vvhich

Magist. 2. d. 22. Tho. ibid. q. 1. Bon. ibid. a. 2. q. 2. Rich. ib. et alij Alexand. Hal. q. 7. m. 2. q. 11. et 12. m. 1. Henr quod 6. q. 6. Suarez. 3. pa disp. 33. sect. 2.

n can sinne, but not as it vvas in him, bicause it vvas hindred: and so (saith he) Christe as man had not *potentiam ordinatam ad peccandū*. As for *Durand*, he cōfesseth that Christe as he is, and as he vvas from the first instant of the Incarnation, could not sinne: bicause he assumed a natur enriched vvith the cleare vision of God, vvhich maketh al the blessed impeccable. But yet the same Doctour, disputing not of that vvhich is, but vvhich only might haue been, saith, that if Christe had taken our humain natur nakedly not indevved vvith that cleare visiō, hee might as man, haue sinned, and seing that damnation is devv to sinne he might as man haue been damned: vvhich he thought argued no imperfection in the diuinitie, no more then that Christe as man dyed. Yet the cōmon opinion of diuines is quite opposit to *Durād.* for they say, that though Christe had assumed mans nature vvithout cleare vision and glorie, yet by hypostatical vnion it had been impeccable. of vvhich they giue diuers reasons. one for example is, bicause the humain natur only by the assumption of it to the diuinitie (vvhich vnion by no acte of ours could be dissolued) had been sanctified, during vvhich Sanctification it could not sinne. A nother is, bicause seing that operations, specially moral actiōs, are attributed to the person, if Christe as man had sinned, the diuine person vvhich had been *circumstantia personæ*, had been culpable. And so in that this humain natur vvas vnited to a diuine person, *vi vnionis*, it could not sinne. Vvheras *Sotcliff* concludeth out of *Durandes* opinion: *So here they say*

*so*

*so that the blasphemous vvordes vvhich they seeke for in Caluin* (and haue found, as aboue vvee haue seen) *are expresselie to be found in their owvn Schoole men*: I must tel him, that his Schoole men being but one or tvvoe, vvho speake also of that, not vvhich is, but vvhich (as they thinke) might haue been, *Caluins* blasphemie is not to be found in the: bicause *Caluin* (as aboue I haue made *Sotcl.* to see) auoucheth that Christe *de facto*, despaired, and suffred *in soule the tormentes of a damned man*, no schoole man saith that he ether sinned or vvas damned.

## Sotcliff.

9. *Bonauentur in 3.d.12 saith that Christe might haue taken flesh of a man, as he did of a vvoman.*

## Kellison.

S. *Bonauentur* proueth at large that it vvas not conuenient, that Chiste should assume vvomanish sex, becausse the vvoman is not to gouern principallie but the man, nether is shee of such dignitie, as is the man; yet in the next question, he sayth, that Christ might haue taken flesh both of man and vvoman, and could so haue sanctified and purified both the man and the vvoman, that as man he should haue been born imaculate, of them both. but yet he sayth, and proueth that this was not conuenient. first bicause his mothers virginitie vvas to bee conserued, and she vvas not to lose any thing by conceiuing and bearing him. Secondly bicause then Christe should haue Bonau. in 3. d. 12. q. 1.

idem q. 2.

had twoe Fathers, and so one should haue seemed insufficient. Thirdly bicause Adam was produced without helpe or concurrence of man or woman, Eue without cõcurrence of a woman, other men by cooperation of man and woman: and consequently Christe was to effectuate the 4. fourth manner, which was by a woman without a man. Lastly as the woman Eue began the sinne, and Adam the man cõsummated and transfused it: so a woman was first to begin our reparation by her consent and conceiuing of Christe, & he a man was to consummat the same. Whereas *Sotcliff* addeth, that to say *Christe might haue taken flesh of a man, destroyeth the article of Christes birth, which was of a virgin-mother*: I answer that it is no good argument a *possibili ad factum*: bicause many thinges might be which are not: or if it destroyeth Christes byrth of a virgin, to say that he might haue been borne of father and mother, though he was born of a mother only: then to say, that *Sotcliff* might haue been begotten of another man then his father, that was, is to make him a bastard, not the sonne of a lawful Father.

## SOTCLIFF.

10. *THe grace of vnion of the twoe natures in Christ, both Alexander, and Thomas and others hold to bee uncreated, which being graunted, it must needs follow, that th' vnion of the twoe natures, was from euerlasting, which is the total ouer throw of our Christian faith.*

KELLISON.

YEt again maister Minister, vvil you retourn to your old facing? *S. Thomas* of *Aquin* calleth this vnió, a real relation in Christes humanitie, & then cócludeth *& ideo oportet dicere quod sit quid creatũ, and therfore vvee must say that it is a create thing.* And in his argument *sed contra* he proueth it, bicause vvhat soeuer beginneth in tyme, is create, but that vnion vvas not from euerlasting, but began in tyme, ergo it is a create thing. The same he holdeth in the 3. booke of sentences, and proueth it in the same manner. And generally the diuines holde that though the diuine person be æternal, yet the vnion of the humain natur is temporal, and vvas not before th'Incarnation in the virgins vvomb. I confesse the same *S. Thomas* demaunding vvhether Christes grace be infinit or noe, affirmeth that his habitual grace is finite, but the grace of vnion is infinit, not that the coniunction and vnion it selfe is infinit, for that he holdeth aboue to be a create and finite relation, but only because by this vnion, the diuine person, and in it the diuinitie it selfe, is substantially communicated to the humain natur: vvhich is a guifte and grace: bicause not devv to the humain natur: and as infinit, as is the diuinitie it selfe.

3. p. q 1. a. 7. in corp.

Th. in 3. d. 1. q. 1. a. 1. q. 3. et d. 3. q. 1. a. 1. q. 1.

Th. 3 p q. 7. a. 11. arg. sed contra et in corp. Suarez ibidem.

SOTCLIFF.

11. IN *Christ, they deny commonly, that there vvas faith or hope. but he that vvanteth faith is an infidel: and he that vvanteth hope is a desperate man &c:*

THe Minister is in desperate case, when he is enforced to vse such desperate argumens: and by this manner of arguing, argueth him selfe as good a diuine as minister. For diuinitie, yea Scriptur teacheth, that the blessed (as Christe was from the first instant of the Incarnation) haue no faith, which is an obscure knowledge, but in lieu therof, are indewed with the cleare vision of God, and yet are not Infidels because they deny noe article of faith, but rather know al, and assent to al by cleare vision, which wee here do by faith only beleeue, but see not. neither haue they hope, bicause hope is of futur thinges, they are in possessiō of the blisse, which wee expect & hope for, and yet despayre they not, bicause they haue that they hoped for, but rather enioy it and delight in the possession. For *Sotcliff* now hopeth and gapeth for a Bishopricke, and if he chaunce to get one, he will hope no more, and yet will not dispaire, but reioice in the possessiō of it. And although Christe had not in this life the glorie of his body, and the blessed Saintes in heauen, as yet haue it not: yet they needed not the Theological vertue of hope, bicause they are in sure profession of the principal reward, at which this Hope aymeth, to wit the glorie and blisse of Soule, which in tyme shal be accompanied (of which also they are sure) with the glorie of the body. But saith *Sotcl.* if Christe had no faith then he beleeued not the Word of God, if he had noe hope, he expected

Heb. 11. Schol. in 3. d. 14. Tho. 3 p. q. 15. a. 10. ad q. 9. a. 2.

not the resurrectiō of his body. Away with this friuolous and childish disputer. He had no faith (*Sir wiseman*) and so beleeued not the word of God by faith, but knew it by a more cleare knowledge: & he had not the habit of the Theological hope, bicause he was in assurance of the principal obiect therof, which is the glorie of soule, but yet he expected and assuredly expected the resurrection and glorie of body, by a more assured expectation, then is our Hope, which is ioyned with feare.

## Sotcliff.

11. *THe Schoolmen commonly hold, that the paynes of Christes Passion weere exceeding great, and yet as touching the Superiour part of his reason, they say that at the same tyme, he was in exceeding pleasur and ioye. But this implieth contradiction. It is also contrarie to Scriptur, Attendite si est dolor vt est dolor meus, behold if ther be any dolour comparable to mine.*

## Kellison.

DIuines, I graunt, do say, and al good Christians, do beleeue with them, that Christe had excessiue sorrow, and vnspeakeable ioy, during his abode in earth. So great was his sorrow, that the Prophet *Esay* calleth him, *the man of sorrows.* and Christe him selfe confesseth that *his soule was sorrowful euen to death.* And although *S Hilarie* seem Tho. 3. p. q. 15. a. 4. s. 6. Isa. 53. Marc. 14. Hil. l. 10.

Trinit. et can. 31. in Mar. vide Magistr. in 3. d. 15.

to deny that in Christe vvas sorrovv, yet ether he meaneth only, that in Christe vvas no necessitie of sorrovv, bicause the glorie of his soule vvould haue hindred it, if he vvould haue permitted it to redound into the inferiour part of his soule; or else he denieth sorrovv in the *Arrians* meaning, vvho sayd that this sorrovv not only touched his soule, but also euen his person, vvhich they thought vvas create. And the cause of this sorrovv vvas not only his death and passion, but the sinnes of man kinde, mans ingratitude, and euen *Sotcliffes* rayling, blaspheming, impugning of Knovvn veritie, and defending of knovvn falsitie. His ioy vvas so great (as being in soule blessed) that S. *Peter* saith it is *vnspeakeable*. Novv that Christe as man vvas blessed by the cleare vision of God, the diuines do affirme, and they proue it out of Scriptures. For Christe him selfe sayd: *God, no man hath seen at any tyme: the only begotten sonne vvhich is in the bosome of his father, he hath declared.* but he declared as man, *ergo* as man he savv God. And again he saith, *I speake that vvhich I haue seen vvith my Father*, but he spake of God and the blessed Trinitie, *ergo* he savv God face to face. And yet again sayth hee, *vvhere I ame, there shal my Minister bee*, to vvit by glorie, *ergo* he vvas then in that glorie and blisse of Soule, vvhich his ministers shal enioy vvith him. That this vision of God must needs cause an excessiue delight, reason vvill essilie persuade. For if as *Cicero* sayth vertue vvould yeeld a great contentment, and vvould stirr vp great affection if it could bee seen: If S. *Catherin* of

1. Pet. 1.

Schol. in 3. d. 14. Th. 3. p. q. 15. a. 10 q. 9. ar. 2. Aug. ep. 96. Io. 1. Io. 8.

*Siena* vvas ſo rauiſhed vvith the ſight of the ſoule of a man: vvhat pleaſur and delight is it for Chriſte as man, and the bleſſed to ſee God face to face, that *ſummum bonum*, that not only *God*, but Goodnes that cõteineth in it ſelfe al goodnes, in which al the beautie of the vvorld is aſſembled, & more then a thouſand vvorldes can compriſe? So that Chriſtes ſoule vvas cheared vvith vnſpeakeable ioy in the continual cõtemplation of this Goodnes and beautie: and yet it vvas alſo exceſſiuelie afflicted vvith ſorrovv, in the ſpeculation of ſo bitter a paſſion he vvas to ſuffer, and of ſo great ingratitude, vvher vvith his loue tovvardes vs vvas to bee revvarded. Vvheras *Sotcliff* ſaith that it is impoſſible, that at one tyme, one ſoule ſhould haue ſo great ioy and ſorrovv theſe being contrarie paſſions: I anſvver him that ſorrovv and ioy are not alvvayes contrarie. For if they bee of diuers obiectes, or of the ſame, in a diuers reſpect, they are not contrarie, but may vvel conſort together. As for example, at the ſame tyme *Sotcliff* may be glad of the death of his enemie, and ſorrovvful for the death of his vvife: bicauſe the obiectes are diuers. Yea his vvife may be glad and ſorrovvful for his death in diuers reſpectes. glad, in that it hath ridde her of a frovvard Huſband, ſorrovvfull in that it hath depriued her of the cõmoditie of his Church liuings. becauſe al though the obiect be the ſame, yet the reſpectes are diuers. And ſo likevviſe Chriſte might take vnſpeakeable comfort and ioy in contemplating the diuine eſſence, and yet might be ſorrovvful and

sadde in the speculation of his crosse and passion: bicause the obiects vvere diuers: yea he might be vvilling and glad to suffer death, and yet fear full and sorovvfull also to thinke that it must be suffered. glad to dye, in respect that his death vvas his Fathers honour and mans Redemption: sorie to dye, in respect that it vvas contrarie to natur and corporal life: becausse though the obiect vvas the same, yet the respect vvas diuers, and the subiectes vvere different also, bicause his ioy vvas in the Superiour part of Reason, his sorrovv in the inferiour. And although *Aristotle* saith, that excessiue sorrovv exileth al ioy, euen of diuers obiectes, yet they being not contrarie vvhen they are of diuers obiectes, or for diuers respects, Christe might hold them together. And therfore notvvithstãding his ioy vvas so great, that it had been sufficient *per redundantiam*, to expell al sorrovv, euen in the inferiour part of the soule, yet Christe vvould not permit his ioy to expel his sorrovv, that so he might suffer for vs, and suffering, satisfie, and satisfying, purchase our Redemption.

Arist. lib. 7. Eth. ca. 14.

SOTCLIFF.

13. *BY the vnion of the natures they teach that Christe vvas made omniscient &c.*

KELLISON.

Tho. 3 p. q 10. a. 1. ti 2.

THis argueth, Sir Deane, that you are not omniscient. For they teach only that Christe as

man knovveth al that God knovveth *scientia visionis*, that is al thinges past, present, and to come, euen vnto our cogitations, becauſe al thinges being ſubiect to him euen as man, and he being as man alſo Iudge of mankinde, and of al mens actions, he vvas to Knovv al theſe thinges. but they ſay that he comprehended not the diuine eſſence, bicauſe he knevv it not ſo much as it was cognoſcible, nether did his vnderſtāding ſo penetrate the diuine eſſenſe, as to bee able therby to diſcouer al thinges poſſible that God can doe. And although *Durand* and *Henricus* imagin that he knevv alſo al poſſible thinges, and ſo vvas omniſcient, yet nether out of their opinion doth it followv, as *Sotcliff* thinkes, that Chriſte as man is immenſe alſo and omnipotent: bicauſe not euerie omniſcience is ioyned vvith omnipotencie but only omniſcience by natur, vvhich is proper to God: and more it is to do, then to knovv, for Chriſte as man knevv at leaſt him ſelfe, and yet could not create him ſelfe, nor any thing elſe, that being (as the Thomiſts thinke) proper to God. As touching *Durand*, whom *Sotcliff* alleageth, hee denyeth flatlie, that Chriſte as man, had formal omnipotencie: only he ſayth, that he had a kind of omnipotencie, vvhich he calleth omnipotencie by aſſiſtaunce, becauſe God vvas ready to confirm al by miracles, vvhich he as man deſired to be confirmed: yea *Durand* ſayth that Chriſte as man, nether by aſſiſtaunce nor any other meanes had povver to create or annihilate.

Dur. in 3. d. 14. q. 2. Henr. quod 7. q. 4.

ſupra. q. 5.

14. HEnricus de Gandauo *taught that ther was another forme in Christes humain natur besides the reasonable soule, and that his death vvas not natural.* Richard de Media villa, *saith his death vvas miraculous &c.*

KELLISON.

TO *Henricus* I giue you leaue to adde *Scotus* and *Durand*, vvho to shevv hovv our *B. Ladie*, vvas cause of some substaunce in Christe, and perceiuing that the nether generated *materiam* *primam*, nor yet the reasonable soule of Christe, that being ingenerable, this created of God, do affirme that besides the reasonnable soule, there vvas in Christe and is in euery man a forme called *forma corporeitatis* vvhich maketh a body: others say there is no other forme but the soule, and the partial formes of flesh, bone, sinnes &c. vvhich giue the complement to a mans body: others say that there is but the reasonnable soule vvhich maketh according to the diuers dispositions it findeth in the body, flesh, bone, sinevv, &c. And vvhat blasphemie is in th'one opinion or other? vvhat is this to a Surucy of Religiō? As touching, that *Sotc.* saith *Hēricus* and *Richardus* do affirme that Christes death vvas miraculous: I answvere that not only they, but many others vvhom *Sotc.* omitteth, do teach that Christes death and passion, vvas in diuers respectes voluntarie and necessarie, natural and miraculous. It vvas voluntarie,

Henr. quod. 2. q. 4. Scot. in 4. d. 1. q. 3. Dur. in 3. d. 21. q. 2.

Schol. in 3. d. 15. et 16. et 3. p q. 47. a. 1. & q. 50.

bicause Christe might haue hindred it ether by the force of his diuinitie, or of his soules glorie, vvhich had imparted to the body immortalitie and impassibilitie, if Christe had permitted: and so in this sense Christe him selfe saith, that he dyed voluntarilie. *No man* (saith he) *taketh my life awaye from me: but I yeeld it of my selfe: and I haue powver to take it again.* Yet supposing that Christe nether by his diuinitie nor soules glorie, vvould impart impassibilitie to his body, he necessarilie dyed, bicause a mortal & passible body, must needes dye, and so if the Ievves had not put him to death, he had in tyme dyed naturallie. And although supposing Christe vvould not succour his body by impassibilitie, his death vvas necessarie and natural, yet becausse as diuines and *S. Austin* saith, a glorious soule according to the ordinarie course imparteth to the body to vvhich it is vnited, impassibilitie and immortalitie, therfore Christes passion, yea thirst and honger, vvas in this sense miraculous, and against the natur of a glorious soule. yet this miracle Christe vsed, that in a passible body he might suffer, and suffring satisfie for vs. Io. 10. Aug. ep. 56. ad Dioscor. Schol. sa.

## Sotclipp.

15. *The Maister of the Sentences l. 3. d. 16. holdeth that Christe by necessarie course of natur neither suffred nor dyed.*

## Kellison.

TO this you are sufficiently answvered, in the former answver.

SOTCLIFF.

16. *Generallie they say it was not necessarie that Christ should suffer death for mankind.* Kellison. *most impiously saith that one drop of Christs bloud, and one teare was a sufficient ransom &c.*

KELLISON.

TO this also aboue I haue answered you in the defence of my 2. Chapter of the third booke, wher I haue shewed that it is impious and derogating to Christes passion, to say, that only that could suffice. Wheras *Sotcliff* asketh how mā could be ransomed by these meanes, that is by a teare, or drop of Christes bloud, *Gods Iustice being not to be satisfied but by death?* he bewrayes his wonted blindnes, that can not see the difference betwixt that which is, and which might haue been. True it is, that Gods Iustice was to be satisfied by death, bicause he had so ordained, and his sonne had so accepted. But lesse would haue serued in a rigour of Iustice, as I haue there shewed. Yea the second person might haue assumed an Angels natur, and in it by the loue of God, or by prayers, or mental adoratiō of the diuine Maiestie, might haue satisfied, bicause euery operation of a reasonable natur vnited hypostatically and personallie to the diuine person, is of infinit worth and merit, by reason of the dignitie of the person. And if God would not haue Redeemed vs by way of iustice, he might franckly and graciously

haue forgiuen al without al satisfaction. This not only, but al diuines, and *S. Austin* and *S. Bernard*, do expresselie affirm. *S. Austin* sayth, that though God had many other meanes to helpe vs, yet there *vvas none more conuenient to heale our miserie*, *S. Bernard* asketh *vvho denyeth* (*Sotcliff* doth) *but that God had many other meanes to redeem vs?* Scholin 3. d. 20. 3. p. q. 1. a. 4. Aug. l. 13. Trin. ca. 10. Bern. ep. 191.

## Sotcliff.

17. *Antisiodorensis l. 3. summa saith that Christ merited nothing as he loued God. But that maketh God a lyar &c.*

## Kellison.

Rather it proueth you to be an ignoraunt diuine. for Christe was at the same tyme a viatour and comprehender. A viatour in th'inferiour part of his soule, and in respect of his mortal body vvhich yet vvas traueling for glorie and to heauen. A comprehender in the superiour part of his soule, by the cleare vision, fruition, and loue of God. And so saith *Altisiodorensis*, Christe as a *comprehender*, by those actes merited not, no more then the blessed angels and Sainctes do in heauen, bicause in that respect he vvas *in termino*, not *in via*, and a *comprehensor* not viator: yea in that respect his loue of God vvas necessarie (for as before, the cleare vision of God necessarilie moueth vs to loue and delight) and so could not be meritorious, al merit being founded in free choise of Altis. l. 3. mac. 1. c. 7.

the will and libertie. But yet, saith he (and to his al diuines accord) as Christe was a viatour, so he merited for him selfe the glorie of his body, the exaltatiō of his name, and the dignitie of a iudge and for vs he merited al grace and glorie: which also he merited, not by the loue of God called *amor beatificus*, for the reasons alleaged: but by his charitie towardes vs which was free; by his preaching, teaching, fasting, praying, death and passion: he in these respectes being a viatour, traueling, for glorie of his body, and not yet enioying it. Yea *Altisiodorensis*, thinkes it probable (but in this contrarieth other diuines) that Christe being in a mortal body, might merit by his loue of God and delight in him: and so was fondly alleaged by *Sotcliff.* Wheras this Minister saith, that to say Christe merited not by the loue of God called *amor beatificus*, is to contrarie scripture and to make God a lyer, who promiseth heauen to them that loue him, and keep his commaundmentes: I answere, that he promiseth that reward to the loue of God of this life, and of those that by faith are yet traueling for glorie and to heauen and are not yet in possession: as for the loue of God in the blessed, it pertaineth to part of their reward, not to their merit. But what moued *Sot.* to labour thus for merit in heauē, that denyeth al merit in earth, but only the spirite of contradiction?

SOTCLIFF.

18. *They do hold for the most part that Christe from the first instant of his conception vvas vir perfectus and had the perfect vse of reason and did merit &c.*

## KELLISON.

AND vvould this Minister make Christe an imperfect *Embrio* or lumpe of flesh as he him selfe vvas, and vvould he set Christe to Schoole, to learne his A. b. c. as the *Agnoites* vvould? or vvould he make him a simple & ignoraunt babe, as he him selfe vvas, and still is? He vvas not then any informe or misshapen *Embrio*, as vvee are before perfect organization, for after that the pure bloud of the virgin, by the povver and operation of the holy Ghost, vvas gathered together, fortie dayes vvere not required to the first conception and organization, as in others: but in a moment this body vvas organized, and no foetuet organized, but a reasonable soule vvas infused, vvhich noe soner vvas done, but both vvere assumed hypostatically. Yet this babe so sodainly conceued and animated, remained 9. monethes in that sacred vvomb, the holy ghost so disposing the matter, that he vvas so long in getting that quantitie, vvhich vvas requisit for generation: that so his generation though miraculous, should not be monstrous. Vvherfore *S. Basil* sayth that Christe vvas no soner conceued, but he vvas perfect. And the *fifte Synod* and diuers Fathers say that after th'Angel *Gabriel* had saluted this virgin, shee noe soner gaue her consent in these vvordes,

Syno. 5. apud Nice. lib. 17. ca. 14. Syn. 6. act. 11. ep. Sophr. cõc. Ephes can. 13. Schol. in 3. d. 3. et 4. Hal. 3. p. q. 8. m. 2. Basil. ho. 15. Luc. 1. Greg. l. 18. mor. c. 36. Damasc. l. 3. c. 2. Aug. ser. 14 de nati. Euth. in Luc. 1.

behold the Hand mayd of our Lord, be it done to me according to thy word, but she conceued Christe God and man: and he was noe soener conceued, but he was repleni shed with al grace, knowledge and perfect vse of reason, by which, euen then he merited, and so then was perfect in respect of his soule; though he had not then the pitch and grough of an able man. wherfore *Hieremie* calleth him euen as then, a man, saying *that a woman shal compass a man.* Nether doth it hence follow that Christe had not a true humain natur; as nether it argued *S. Iohn Baptist* to be of another natur then others, bicause he reioiced in his mothers wōb, and had euen then vse of reason, and fulnesse of grace and the spirit of prophecie.

Ier. 31.
Tho. 3. p. q. 34. a. 1. 2. 3. 4 et 9. 11. a. 1. q. 12. a. 2.

## SOTCLIEF.

19. *Although Christe be the vniuersal mediatour of al mankind yet Petrus de Tarentesia, and Richard de Media villa teach that Prelates and Saincts are particuler mediatours, &c.*

## KELLISON.

TO this you are answered in the last chapter of my third booke, where I haue told you, that Christe only is mediatour of Redemption, prælates and Preists, and Saincts both liuing and dead, are mediatours only of intercession, and secondarie intercession, for Christe also is the cheefe intercessour.

SOXCLIFF.

10. *They deny that Christe vvas a man during the tyme he lay in the graue. In that tyme also Antisiodorensis doth deny him to be our redeemer, as this vvord Redeemer signifieth the vvorker of the Mysterie of our Redemption, &c.*

KELLISON.

IF this *Deane*, vnderstood vvhat he sayd, he vvould neuer haue brought these speeches for blasphemies, or absurdities. For *S. Thomas*, *S. Bonauentur*, *Durand*, *Altisiodorensis*, and the greatest part of diuines do hold, that Christe in the 3. dayes that he vvas dead vvas no man, though the Maister of the sentences seem to thinke otherwise, bicause he thinketh it sufficient to make Christe at that tyme man, that his body and soule remayned stil vnited to the diuine person, though separated the one from the other. But *Sotc.* following his Great Grand-father *Vvicleph*, vvho affirmed that in those three dayes the sonne of God vvas Christe, counts it blasphemie, to say that Christ then vvas not man. Yet, although it seem hard to an vnlerned minister, I shal proue manifestly, that Christ then vvas not man. And first by the Metaphysical definition of a man, vvhich is *animal rationale*, a reasonable liuing creatur. For then Christe vvas not *vnum* being dead, *ergo* he vvas not *animal*: if he vvas not *animal*, he vvas not *homo*.

Th. 3 p. q. 50. a. 4. Bon. in 3. d. 22. q. 1. Dur. ibid. q. 1. et 2. Altis. l. 3. tract. 1. c. 9. q. 1. a. 4.

ex Tho. vvald. l. 1. de fi. fid. c. 34.

bicause of vvhom the Superiour is denyed the inferiour also is denyed. And contrarievvise if Christ in the 3. dayes vvas man, he vvas *animal*, if he vvas *animal*, he vvas *vivens*, and so vvas not dead, vvhich to say, is a grosse heresie of the *Gnosticks*, vvho sayd Christe suffred not death, but *Simon Cyrenens* for him. Secondly by a Physical definition, man is defined to bee a substaunce composed of soule and body linked together, so that nether the soule is a man, nether the body is a man, nor both separated are a man (for then *Sotcliff* dead should still be a man) but both vnited: but in those dayes Christes body and soule vvere not vnited, *ergo* then he vvas not man. Thirdly if Christe in these dayes vvas man, not-vvithstanding that his soule vvas separated by death from his body: then *Sotcliff* vvhen he is dead: not-vvithstanding the same separation shalbe man, and consequently *animal*, and *vivens*, and so after death living, and immortal. vvhence followveth that by death, his marriage shal not be dissolued, vvhich his vvife vvould not haue true, nor his Church liuinges lost, vvhich they that gape for them desire not to be true: yea then it followveth that *Sotcliffs* predecessour in his Deanrie, is still liuing, bicause he is still man, and so *Sotcliff* is an intruder. Fourthly if Christe then vvas a man, I demaund where he vvas man? not in the graue, or on the crosse, bicause there only vvas his body: not in *Limbo*, or the Hel vvhere the Saintes of the old lavv vvere deteyned, bicause there only vvas his soule: not in any other place, ether in heauen or earth, bi-

ex Ireo. l. 1. ca 31.

tauſe in no other place vvas ether his ſoule or body, *ergo* he vvas no vvhere man, and conſequentlie not man. Laſtly *Sotdiff* in holding Chriſte to bee man in thoſe 3. dayes, denyeth three principal articles of Chriſtian faith. For if Chriſte then vvas man he vvas *viuens* liuing: If liuing, he dyed not, if he dyed not, he roſe not againe frō death to life, if he dyed not, he redeemed vs not, bicauſe his death vvas our Redemption. And ſo the death, and Reſurrection, and Redēption, are no articles of faith. Hēce it followveth that although (as *Alsiſiodorenſis* ſaith) Chriſte in theſe three dayes Chriſte vvas *Redemptor authoritatu*, being ſtill God, yet he vvas not then, *Redemptor miniſterij*, noe nor Prieſt in him ſelfe (though he vvas ſtil in his Apoſtles) bicauſe as man only he vvas Prieſt. Yea then he vvas not Chriſte, bicauſe though his diuine perſon vvas then, yet that only is not Chriſte; for Chriſte is God and man. Yet doth it not hēce followv, that Chriſte is not an æternal Prieſt, bicauſe, though in this ovvn perſon, he then vvas not Prieſt *in actu*, bicauſe he vvas not man; yet ſo litle an interruption can not take avvay his æternal Prieſthood, hee eſpecially euē then, being Prieſt in his miniſters the Apoſtles, and hauing none to ſucceed him. Vvherfore t oſe ſpeeches, *Chriſte vvas buried*, Chriſte *deſcended into Hel:* are vndertſtood by a figure, called *Synecdoche*, vvhich taketh the part for the vvholle: and ſo Chriſte deſcended to hel bicauſe his ſoule did, and remained in the graue bicauſe his body did. Hence it followveth that the diuine perſon in thoſe three dayes had Supra.

dismissed the total humain nature, bicause that by separation of the soule and body was lost, but yet he neuer dismissed ether soule or body, bicause they remained vnited to the diuinitie, though separated from eche other. So that if *Sotc.* had been ether Philosopher or man, and not some vnreasonable creature, he would neuer haue counted it blasphemie to say, that Christe in the 3. dayes that he was dead, was not man.

## SOTCLIFF.

11. *Albertus and others say that Deuilles, carie their Hel about with them, which if it be granted the the Hel of Papists is no determinate place, neither is it in the bowels of the earth, but also aboue the earth, and in the ayre, and in the Popes Chamber, where the deuil is there.*

## KELLISON.

When so they speake, they mean not the place but the payne of Hel, or as some thinke some part of the fier, which they carrye with them whether soeuer they goe. For they hold the place to bee in the center of the earth immoueable, though, as aboue wee haue seen, *Luther* and *Caluin* deny al local hel, yea al true fire in Hel. And in this sense Hel is liker to bee in *Sotcliffes* pulpit, yea in his mouth also when he preacheth false doctrine, rayleth and blasphemeth, bicause the deuil (as it is like) is there, who carieth his Hel, that is his payne with him.

SOTCLIFF.

22. *Bellarmin l. 1. de missa cap. 2. saith that in a true sacrifice that is offered to God it is required that it be destroyed, If then the Papists offer up the verie body and bloud of Christe in the Masse, then they destroy Christes body and bloud, and deprive vs of Christes body. But this is a blasphemous assertion &c.*

KELLISON.

*Bellarmine* in that sayth trulie, and he proueth by al the Sacrifices in scripture, that a sacrifice must bee consumed or chaunged reallie in some sorte. and he proueth it by 2. reasons. The one is, bicause al Sacrifices before Christe, being figures of the Sacrifice of the crosse, vvere to be Killed if they vvere liuing thinges, or to bee changed reallie in some other manner, that they might signifie and resemble the death of Christe, immolated on the crosse. the other reason is, bicause a Sacrifice is a most submissiue protestation of our subiection to the diuine maiestie, and of his dominion euen ouer the substaunce of thinges, & therfore by Sacrifice not only the vse, but also the substaunce is to bee offered to God and consumed or changed for his honour. And in the 27. *chapter* of the same book, he shevverh that the Sacrifice of the masse eué in this respect is a true Sacrifice bicause though Christe bee not there truly killed (as it vvas not necessarie this being an vnbloudie Sacrifice) yet Christes body by

consecration is vnder the formes of bread, and so hath the forme of foode, and by eating is changed in external forme, bicause the formes of brede are reallie cõsumed, and Christes body though it lose not real being, yet it loseth his Sacramental being, and so there is euen in this Sacrifice some real mutation. For though Christes body in it selfe suffreth nothing, as being impassible: yet it is consumed in th'external accidẽtes of bread, and though it lose not the natural, yet by communion, it loseth the Sacramental being.

SOTCLIFFE.

23. *THey hold that not only vvicked and reprobate men but also that dogges and hogges may eate vp Christes true body. But that is contrarie to al reason not only to cast holy thinges but also the redeemer of the vvorld to Hogges and dogges.*

KELLISON.

CErtes lesse irreuerence in some sort it were, to giue Christes body to a Hogge then to such a bavvling and blaspheming fellovv as you are, by hovv much, sinne, and especiallie blasphemie is more odious to God, then Hoggish filthines. But our minister is to learn, that some Catholiques do hold that Hogges and vnreasonable beastes do neuer receue the body of Christe, because Christe vvith-dravveth his præsence in that case, he hauing ordeined this Sacrament only for men not for beastes, vvho are not capable of such nurriture: Yet the same men confesse that sinners receue his body reallie and Sacramental-

lie, bicause this Sacrament vvas ordained for men and for their nutriture, and it is *per accidens*, and a chaunce that sinners, by reason of their sinne, are vncapable of the fruict and grace vvhich therbie is receued. And so these men vvould tel *Sotcliff* that hogges and mise, can not receue the body of Christe. Others cõmonly do distinguish 4. kindes of eating and receuing Christes body. The first is spiritual only. so the deuout by faith and deuout desire do communicate. the second is Sacramental only. so sinners receue it: for they receue the Sacramẽt though no fruict but hurt thereby in receuing it vnvvorthile. The third is Sacramental and spiritual: so the iust and those that approch vvorthilie and not guiltie of mortal sinne receue it. The fourth is real only, & thus they say brute beastes vvhich deuour the formes of bread do also svvallovv dovvn the body of Christe, bicause the body being reallie conteined vvith in the accidẽtes of bread, those being eaten, the body of Christe must needes be svvallovved dovvn vvith them: but vvith this difference, that the formes of bread are deuided and broken, but the body of Christe, being impassible, and hauing indiuisible existẽce, suffreth nothing, bee it svvallovved dovvne the throate, or cast into the fier, or vvater. Or if dogges can not eate Christes body reallie, vvhy did *Optatus* l. 2. cõplain of the Donatistes for casting th'Eucharist tõ dogges. I can giue *Sotcliff* as familiare an example, as him selfe, is to him selfe. If he had been deuoured by a vvhale in the sea, his soule hasi been deuoured

4. Manners of eõmunicating. as Tho. 3 p. q. 80. a. 1. 3. Suarez. Caiet. ibid.

vvith the bodye, and yet his soule had not suffred any thing, only it should after a litle space leaue the bodie, as Christes body dothe the formes of bread vvhen they are corrupted, bicause then it can be no more in them as in a Sacrament and signe of spiritual food. likevvise if he had been eaten by dogges, they vvith their teeth had torne and minced his bodie, but had neuer fastned tooth in his soule conteined vvith in the bodie, though vvhen the bodie is consumed the soule leaueth the bodie, it being no more any apt subiect. And this al Lutheranes (whom *Sotcliff*, as vvee haue seen aboue, taketh for his brethren) must needes say as vvel as vvee: bicause they holding that Christs body is reallie in the Sacramẽt though with bread, in wch vvee differ from them, they also must hold aswell as wee that sinners receue reallie & Sacramẽtallie the bodie of Christe, bicause, if ye bodie bee reallie in the Sacrament, they receuing the Sacrament, receue the bodie of Christe vvith it, though to their ovvn damnation. And therfore *S. Paule* sayth that he that *eateth and drinketh vnvvorthilie, eateth and drinketh his iudgemẽt*. And vvhy? bicause *he discerneth not the bodie of our lord*, vvhich he eateth. So that *Caluin* that saith that the reprobate and vvicked though they eate *Symbola, non tamen corpus Domini, the signes but not the body of our lord*, contradicteth flatlie scriptur. But yet *Caluin* auouching that in this Sacrament Christe is eaten only by faith must needs say also, that only the iust receue this Sacramẽt, bicause faith iustifieth: vvhich is the cause vvhy *Sotcliff* counteth it absurd in Ca-

1. Cor. 11.

Caluin li. 4. Inst. ca. 17. §. 31. 34. et l. cõt. Heshus.

tholikes, vvho hold that ſinners receue the body, of Chriſte. But *S. Auſtin* in this point ſtandeth for Catholikes againſt al Caluiniſtes, for he in diuers places affirmeth that ſinners receue the body of Chriſte, and ſayth it is noe meruail, ſeing that he communicated Iudas vvith his ovvn handes, and receued a kiſſe of his mouth. Yea this they them ſelues muſt ſay though therin they contradict thē ſelues For although *Luther* requireth faith as a due præparation and vvhich he calleth the *ſereniste and peace of conſcience*, yea out iuſtice and ſanctification, as vve haue ſeen aboue (vvhence followeth that none but the iuſt and vvho haue quieted conſcience, ought to receue this Sacrament) yet he alſo ſayth, that the vvicked receue the body of Chriſte, as vvel as the iuſte. yea he ſayth that *they come beſt diſpoſed to this Sacrament vvho are vvorſt diſpoſed, vvhoe haue guiltie, afflicted, perturbed, confuſed, and erroneous conſciences*: Vvhence followeth neceſſarilie that ſinners do eate Chriſtes bodie, and eſpeciallie in his opinion, vvho holdeth Chriſtes bodie, to be reallie in the ſacramēt. And although Caluin acknovvledge no other eating then by faith, vvhich he ſayth iuſtifieth; and conſequentlie cā not ſay that ſinners eate it: yet he alſo ſaith, that if vvee ſeeke to come vvhortilie, *deſperatio tantum & exitialis ruina nos manet, deſperation only and ruine remaineth for vs*, and in the next paragraphe, he ſaith *leaſt vvee fall into this precipice, let vs remember that theſe ſacred banquets are medecins to ſinners*: vvhence followeth that ſinners receue this Sacrament. and ſeing that *Caluin* alſo holdeth, that the faithfull

Aug lib 5. de bap ca. 8. l. 1. cont. Creſcon. cap. 25 ep. 110. cap. 27 ep. 162.

Luth l ca. Bab c. de Euchar. an. 1520.

Luth con. artic. looā. Infartic. Smalcald. Luth cōc. de digna præpar. an. 1518. cont de confeſſ et Euch. an. 1520. l. ca. Bab. c de Euchar.

Calu. l. 4. Inſt. cap. 17. §. 41. et 42.

Calu. li. 4. Inſt cap. 10. §. 5. 6 11. 12.

by faith, do trulie receue Christes bodie & blood, it followeth that sinners receue trulie the bodie and blood of Christe: and that, he also in another respect must say, though he contrarie him selfe therin: bicause, he saith the faithfull do trulie with the signes receue Christes bodie, but euen they are sinners before God, bicause faith, as euen he thinkes, doth not trulie iustifie vs & clense vs, *ergo* sinners in *Caluins* opinion also, do trulie receue Christes bodie: and if sinners receue it, it is noe greater indignitie to say that in some cases dogges and mise may eate it, not spirituallie nor Sacramentallie, but reallie.

SOTCLIFF.

24. *They beleeue and teach that Christs bodie is in the Sacrament reallie although it bee nether seen nor felt there, they beleeue also that Christes bodie is in heauen visible and in earth inuisible, at one tyme: which ouerthroweth Christes humain natur, for neuer was ther man that hand such a bodie.*

KELLISON.

RAther, neuer was there Christian that argued so like a Turke or Iewe, as you doe: who reason of matters of faith, as though they were obiectes of sense. For if it bee a good argument, *Christes bodie is not seen nor felt in the Sacrament, ergo it is not there*, it would proue that in *Sotcliff* is nether wit nor soule, bicause nether is ether seen, or felt. And if *Sotcliff* had liued amongest the Iewes

in Christes tyme, he might haue done them good seruice by thus arguing: for hee might as wel haue concluded, that Christe vvas not God, bicause he seemed to bee a man as others vvere, and his diuinitie vvas nether seen, nor felt. But seing that Christe vvas able to bee as good as his vvorde, & sayd also that the thing hee held in his handes, is his bodie, vvee beleeue it, though vvee see it not: knovving that the Apostle sayth, that *faith is of thinges that appeare not*. And this *Sotcliff* also if he had but one crumme of faith or vvitte, would beleeue, knovving that Christe, vvho is veritie hath auerred it, and the Church, vvhich is the *pillar of veritie* hath defined Christes vvordes so to bee vnderstood, vvhom, not to beleeue, saith *S. Austin*, is manifest Madnes, especiallie seing that the pillar of Truth can not fayle or fall, but al truth also in matters of faith must fayle and fall vvith it. Vvheras *Sotcliff* saith *that there vvas neuer man had such a bodie &c.* I must tel him, that there Was neuer man but Christe, that Was God & man, terrestrial and cælestial, sonne of a virgin and of a mother vvithout a Father, and so no meruail, if some thing more be graũted to him then to other men. Or if *Sotcliff* vvill needes haue it a good argument, *There vvas neuer any other man that had such a body that could bee in heauen visible and in earth visible at one tyme, ergo Christe had not*: he may by the same argument conclude that Christe could not be borne of a virgin, nor that he & S. Peter vvalked on the Water, nor that he passed the heauẽs vvithout beaking or deuiding them, bicause there

Mat. 26.

Heb. 11.

Mat. 26.

1. Tim. 4.

Aug. ep. 118.

vvere neuer men that had such bodies. yea he might by this argument disproue the historie of the hatchet-head that ascended to the steale in the water, bicause there vvas neuer hatchet made of such Iron. but our Philosopher should haue distinguished betvven that vvhich bodies can doe of their ovvn natur, and vvhat they may doe, by Goddes povver.

SOYCLIFF.

25: *Bel. l. de Incarnatione cap. 11. saith that God is able to turne al the vvorld into bread and that al this bread may be turned into Christes body. &c.*

KELLISON.

HE sayth so in deed. And vvil you limit Gods povver according to the narrovvnes and smallovvnes of your vvitte? He that created al thinges of nothing, can he not turne one thing into another? His povver is his vvill and vvord, and therfore vvhen there vvas nothing but him selfe, he spake the vvorld and bad the vvorld to bee: and of nothing, it vvas presentlie so great and huge a thing, as vvee see. The vvorld being created, least it should bee steril, he commaunded the Earth to bring forth Plantes, hearbes, and trees, & these to bring forth seeds flovvres and fruictes according to their Kind, and they haue euer since obeyed this voice and vvord though they hard it not: And vvas he not able to bee as good as his vvord, vvhen he commaunded bread to turn into

to. 1. l 3. 1. de Sacr. c. 11. bt. c.

Gen. 1.

Transubstantiatiō proued.

his bodie? *The vvord of Christe* (saith S. Ambrose) *effectuateth this Sacrament. Vvhat vvord of Christe? for* Ambr. l. 4. de Sacr. cap. 4.
*suth that, by vvhich al thinges vvere made. God commaunded, and Heauen vvas made. God commaunded and the Earth vvas made. God commaunded and the Seas vvere made. God commaunded, and al creaturs vvere generated. Thou seest therfore hovv povverable is the Word of Christe, If then there bee such force in the vvord of our Lord, to make to begin those thinges that vvere not: hovv much more povverable is he to make those thinges that are, to bee chaunged into others. Heauen vvas not, the Sea vvas not, th' Earth vvas not But heare him saying: he sayd, the vvord, and they vvere made, hee commaunded and they vvere created. Therfore, that I may answer thee, it vvas not the bodie of Christe before consecration, but after consecration I say vnto thee, that novv it is the bodie of Christe. He spake the vvord, & it vvas done, he cõmaunded and it was created.* Vvhere vvee see that *S. Ambrose* limiteth not Gods povver as *Scot* doth: but thinketh that he that could create al of nothing could turne one into another, and in perticuler bread into Christes body. *Saint Cyril,* Cyril. Catech 4. myst.
subscribeth to him saying, *Aquam olim, &c. he conuerted in tymes past vvater into vvine in Cane of Galilie, and shal vvee thinke him litle vvorthie to be credited, that he chaunged vvine into his bloud?*

2. And let our incredulous Minister tell mee, vvhy this should bee impossible to him, that can do al that is possible? Do vvee not see daylie hovv in caues of the earth, ayre is turned cõtinuallie into vvater, vvhich is cause of running Springes? Conuersions.
do vvee not see wood turned into fier, a litle graine into an huge tree, a litle blacke seed into a sil-

ke-vvorme vvhich is so often metaphorphized are not the same hearbes, fructes, bread, and drinke, by nutrition, cõuerted into flesh, blood, sinevves, bones? Do wee not see fountaines conuerte vvord into stone? Do vvee not see the same humour, vvhich the roote sucketh from the earth, in the roote turned into the substaunce of rootes, in the body of the tree into vvood, in the harte of the trée into pith or sapp, in the barke into that rough skinne, in the bovves into bovves, in the leaues into leaues, in the flovvres and fruites into those litle substaunces? Do vvee not see the corruption of one thing to be the generation of another, and so the vvorld perpetuated by a continual conuersion of one thing into another? But *Sotcliff* vvill answer that in these conuersions there is a subiect to receue the action, by vvhich the conuersion is effectuated: for vvhen by th'action of fier vvood is turned into fier, the matter of the vvood receueth the forme of fier, and leaueth the forme of vvood and so vvood becommeth fier. I graunt him noe, lesse, and therfore these conuersions also are natural. But yet he is a natural, if he vvill not graunt also that God being Autour of natur, may exceed the boundes of natur, and so conuert one thing totallie into another, as he created al of nothing and of noe matter at al. For to limit Goddes povver vvithin the boundes of natur, is to say that he is not aboue natur, and consequentlie that the vvorker, is not aboue his vvorke vvhich is natur: yea it is to say, that God can do no more then he hath done, or ordinarilie vseth to

doe. Vvherfore as God aboue the courſe of natur made the Sunne ſtay his courſe, made the fier not to burn, the heauy body not to ſinke in the vvater, fedd vvith 5 *Barly loues* and 2. fiſhes 5000. people, and that ſo fullie, that the reliques of their feaſt vvere greater then the feaſt it ſelfe: ſo can hee turn one thing totallie into another, though it be aboue natur. Tell me then *Sotcliff* vvhy you are ſo hard of beleefe in this pointe? He that turned vvater in to blood, can he not turne vvine into bloud? He that turned a rocke into vvater, ar odde into a ſerpent, and euery day turneth bread into your bodie and vvine into your bloud, vvhy can he not turn bread and vvine into his ovvn body and bloud? Giue glorie then to God, and confeſſe that Chriſte as he is more then you can conceue, elſe hevvere not God: ſo he can do more then your ſhallovv head can imagin, elſe he vvere not omnipotent. Mat. 17.

3. And if God can turn bread into his bodie, thē he ſaying, *this is my bodie*, made it his bodie, and ſeing that bread remaining bread, can not be reallie Chriſtes bodie (and yet Chriſte making his laſt vvill, and enacting a lavve ſpake properlie not figuratiuelie, as I haue proued in my Surucy) it followveth that Chriſte turned the bread into his bodie, elſe he had not been as good as his vvord, yea he had ſpoken falſelie. For as vvhen ſhevving bread, vvee ſay, this is breade, and demonſtrating a purſe, vvee ſay this is gold, the ſenſe is: the contentes vnder this external forme you ſee, is bread, is gold: and if there were any thing elſe vn- Mat. 26. Mar 14. Luc 22. 1. Cor 11. booke 8.

der the accidentes of bread then bread, or vvithin the purse then gold, the propositions vvere false so Christe shevving bread, and saying this is my bodie, the sense vvas, the contente vnder these accidentes of bread is my bodie: and if, as *Luther* saith, there had been also the substaunce of bread, the proposition had been as false, as if one shevving a purse of Gold and siluer, I should haue sayd this is gold. And if the vvholle conteined vnder th'Accidentes of bread be Christes body, then there is noe bread after the vvordes pronounced, and consequentlie, it is conuerted and Transubstantiated into Christes body: especiallie the diuines and fathers saying, that Christes vvords, vvrought vvhat they signified.

Ambrose l 4. de fide ca. 6. Aug. ser. 28. de verbis Apost. et ca. verum sub figura. de conser. d. 2. Hier. ep ad Hebod. Tertul. l. 4. ca. 40. cont. Marcion. cõc. Trid. sel. 13. cap. 4. Iren. lib. 4. cap. 34. Ambr. l 3. de Sacr. ca. 4.

4. Vvherfore *S. Ambrose* and *S Ciril*, vvhose vvordes I haue aboue alleaged, do expresselie say that Christe changed bread into his bodie: and that they mean reallie, it appeareth by theyr parangoning this conuersion, vvith creation and other real and miraculous conuersions. *S. Irenem* saith that after the vvordes of Consecration vvhich he calleth *Inuocation*, this Sacrament is no more common bread, but the Eucharist consisting of tvvoe thinges, terrene and celestial, that is the terren formes of bread, and the spiritual bodie of Christe, spiritual, not in substaunce but in qualitie and manner of existence: vvherfore *Irenæus* compareth this mutation of bread into ihe *Eucharist*, vvith the resurrection and other real chaunginges and mutations. *S. Ambrose* saith that after consecration *de pane fit corpus Christi, of bread is made the bodie of Christe*,

*fie*, vvhich vvordes argue a real conuerſion, as vvhen vvee ſay, of corn is made bread, of milke cheeſe, of grapes vvine, of vvine by nutrition, is made bloud, & c. *S. Auſtin* ſaith *that by the holy Ghoſt Chriſtes bodie is povvreably created and made of the ſubſtaunce of bread*: vvhich mutation he cõpareth alſo to the conuerſion of Lothes vvife into ſalt. *S. Cipian* ſaith that bread is chaunged into Chriſtes bodie and vvine into his bloud, by th' omnipotẽcie of God, & not in *figure only* and external apparẽce, *but alſo in natur*, that is ſubſtaunce. *S. Bernard* ſaith in Chriſts name, *the hoſte vvhich thou ſeeſt, novv is not bread, but my fleſh, likevviſe this liquour vvhich thou ſeeſt, novv is not vvine but my bloud, as the formes there are ſeen, though the thinges or ſubſtaunces are beleeued not to be there.* And before them al, *S. Iuſtin martyr* ſayth, *that as by the vvord of God Chriſte became incarnate, ſo by the myſtical prayer* (of conſecration) *bread becomes the fleſh of Chriſte.* By vvhich manner of ſpeeches, and compariſons, vvee ſee, that the fathers are of opinion, that the bread and vvine are reallie chaunged into Chriſtes bodie and bloud: for, theſe ſpeeches and compariſons vvere ridicoulous, if they imported no other mutation and chaunge, then *Caluin* maketh, vvho putteth no more mutation in the bread, then is in an Iuy-buſh, vvhen in hanging it before the Inne, of Iuye, it is made a ſigne.

Aug. cap. vtrum ſub figura. de conſecr. d. 2.

Aug apud vvald. to. 2. de Sacr. c. 83. Cipr. ler. de Cæna Domi. Bern. de Cæna domini.

Iuſtin. Apol. 2.

5. Vvheras *Sotcliff* thinketh Bellarmines opinion ſtraunge, by vvhich he holdeth that God might turne al the vvorld into bread, and this bread into his bodye, he is a ſtraunge man to meaſure Godds povver by his ovvn. For vvhy ſhould he

thinke it more repugnaunt to turn the vvorld into bread then to create the vvorld of nothing? Nether hence should it followv (as *Sotcliff* thinkes) that if God should turne al the vvorld into bread, the bread must bee as bigge as the vvorld, bicause God might turne it into a peny lofe: nor that if a vvorld of bread vvere turned into Christes body, that should bee as great as the vvorld, bicause God might turn an elephant into an Ante, and an Ante into an Elephant, and yet nether should the Ante be as bigge as an Elephãt nor th'Elephant as litle as an Ante. only the one substaunce should succeed to the other, and naturallie also in place of the other, though not according to the quãtitie of the other. Yet I graunt that as Christes body vvhollie succeedeth in euerie part of the bread, bicause euerie part is conuerted into his vvholle bodie: so if God should conuert euery parte of a vvorld of bread into Christes body, his body should bee by repetition vvhollie in the vvholle vvorld and in euerie parte of it, and yet should it not bee immense as God is, bicause God is also vvithout the vvorld in those infinite and imaginarie spaces, as many diuines do affirme: and hee is thus immense by natur, Christes bodie could not haue this by natur but by miracle: yea Christes bodie should bee no bigger in substaunce and intrinsecal dimensions then it is, though by a miraculous repetition it should bee in al places of the vvorld. For although Christes body (defacto) by repetiõ is in thousandes of Aultars, yet is it no bigger

in all Aultares, pixes, and hoſtes, then in one. But to much of theſe curioſities: into which if I haue ſeemed to vvade to deep, I muſt excuſe my ſelfe by *Sotcliffe*, vvhom I haue taken vppon me to follovv: and I hope ſo to haue explicated this myſterie of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that I haue vvaded out, and the learned Reader vvith mee, *Sotcliff* hath been plunged ouer heade and eares, and ſticketh ſtill faſt in the myre, vvhere I leaue him, till he cry for helpe.

## SOTCLIFF.

16. *THey pray to Sainctes to help them and to intercede for them: but vvhat is more abſurd then to leaue Chriſte and to pray to thoſe of vvhom vve haue no certaintie &c.*

## KELLISON.

1. RAther nothing more abſurd, then for you to thinke, that to pray to Chriſtes Sainctes and freindes to pray for vs, is to leaue Chriſte, and not rather to ſupplicate to Chriſte but by thoſe that are in better credit vvith him. Or if this be to leaue Chriſte, then you left *King Iames*, vvhen you ſpake to ſome of his counſellers or fauourites for your Chaplinſhip, and dedicated your booke to the *Lord Cheeſe Baron*, and by him couertlie pleaded for a Biſhopricke or *habilitie to publiſh your bookes*: vvhich are in ſuch requeſt, that, vvheras Rimers and Ballad-makers gain by their verſes, you are fayn to print your

ſee his 1 pi
ſle Dedic

bookes on your owne cost. Certes as it is not to leaue God, to take heate of the fier, light of the sunne, influences from the heauens, bicause God hath appointed them as secondarie causes to help vs: so is it not to leaue Christe, to fly vnto his Angelles and Saincts for help by their prayers, they being cõstituted by Christe, Maisters of requests to propose and further our sutes, and second causes also to assist and help vs. For as in natural thinges this inferiour and Sublunair World, is gouerned by the Superiour, I meane the heauens starres and planets: so in supernatural thinges th'inferiour vvorld of the Church militaunt in Earth, is gouerned by the superiour World of the Churche Triumphaunt, consisting of Saintes and Angels. For Christ hath promised that vvho so euer *shal ouercome to the end*, as Saincts haue done, they shal haue *power ouer nations and shal rule vvith a rod of iron*.

Apoc. 2.

2. But saith *Sotcl.* Papistes say they are not assured of their owne Saluatiõ, and so they are much lesse assured of other mennes Saluation, and consequentlie do foolishly pray to them, of vvhose Saluation they are not assured. I answer that wee pray to the Saintes of this life also, as scripture warranteth, and yet vvee are not assured of them but only hope and probably thinke they are Saintes, and so hauing at least hope and probabilitie of dead Saincts Saluation, vvhy may vvee not also pray to them? But yet in deed vvee haue more assuraunce of the dead Saincts Saluation, ether by their miracles, or by their martyrdon (for of

1 Reg. 7. Iob. 42. Ephes. 6. 2. Thess. 3. Heb. 3. et vlt.

martyrs, the Church hath euer had such assurauncethat she prayeth not for them) or by the Popes and Churches canonization. For the Pope and church hauing examined their liues, deathes, and miracles, haue proposed them vnto vs for Sainctes: vvhich assurance is greater, then vve can haue of our selues or any liuing Sainctes, to vvhom yet *S. Paule* and others prayed. And is *Sote.* assured of his saluation? It seemeth, that he thinkes he is, bicause he carpeth at Catholikes, for holding that no man vvithout reuelation, can bee assured (though he may haue a great hope free from doubt and anxietie though not feare) of his ovvn sanctitie or saluation: And *Luther* saith that faith giueth al true Christians this assurauncе, to vvhom *Zuinglius* subscribeth saying, *ad cælum tantum prorsus iuris habemus quantum Christus ipse*, &c. *vve haue as much right to heauen as Christe him selfe, neither can vvee be damned vnlesse he be damned, nor he saued vnles vve be saued.* *Caluin* saith *that no man is trulie faithfull vnles by a solid persuasion, he perswade him selfe that God is propitious and fauourable vnto him, and presume al thinges vppon his benignitie, and relying on his promises* (as though God had made a promise to *Caluin* in particuler) *presumeth an vndoubted expectation of saluation.* And *Soteliff* their Scholler saith *that euerie true Christian led by Gods spirit, is to assure him selfe of Gods fauour.* And so although *Caluin* confesseth that there are so many labyrinthes, meandres, vvininges and turninges, and lurking places, in a mans conscience, that it deceueth often tymes mans ovvn selfe, and although also *Ecclesiasticus*

Aug ser. 17. de verbis Apost.

Ephes. 6. 1. Thess. 5. Heb 3. & vlt.

Luth. to. 1. art. 11. & 12. & in c. 2. Gal. Zuin disp. Tigur. fol. 628.

Caln. l. 3. Inst c. 2. § 16. & § 19.

Sote pag. 72.

Calu l. 3. Instit. c. 2. § 10.

biddes vs *not to be secure of our sinne forgiuen*, although
Eccl. 5. *Iob feared al his vvorkes*, and *S. Paule* biddes *him that*
Rom. 11. *standeth, feare falling*, and to *vvorke his saluation vvith*
Phil. 2. *trembling*, yet *Calum* and *Sotcliff*, guiltie of so many crimes, are cocke sure of saluation, and remission of their sinnes, and so need nether pray to God to for giue them their Trespasses, nor to bring them to life euerlasting, they by faith (vvhich *S. Paule*
Rom. 10. sayth must goe before prayer) being assured of that before hand. But vvheron is this their assurance grounded? On reuelation? they experience no such thing. on Christes promises? they vvere made generallie, not to *Sotcliff* in particuler, and on condition also that vvee beleeue and hope aright, loue God aboue al, hate sinne from our harte and aboue al, keep the commaundements: vvhich *Sotcliff* is not assured to haue performed, yea he is sure of the contrarie. Or if *Sotc.* say that heauen is promised vvithout al condition, then he need to feare no transgression of lavves, nor sinnes, and so the gap is layed open to al vice. Vvee are assured, vvil *Sotcliff* say, bicause Christe hath payed the price of our Redemption. True he hath, but yet thousandes are damned. The reason, vvil our Minister say, is, bicause they apply not this price. And hovv must they apply it? They must beleeue, sayth he, firmelie and vvithout al doubt, that Christes iustice is theirs. In particuler? yea saith hee, in particuler. But then I demaund vvhether Christes iustice bee *Sotcliffes* iustice in particuler before he beleeue so, or only by beleeuing? If before he beleeue so, then is he made iust

before he beleeue ſo, and ſo ſhould be iuſt although he ſhould not beleeue ſo, and conſequentlie is not made iuſt by faith, contrarie to that their maxime, *only faith iuſtifieth*. If by beleeuing Chriſtes iuſtice to bee his in particuler: then before he beleeueth ſo, Chriſtes iuſtice is not his in particuler, and ſo *Sotcliff* muſt beleeue it before it bee ſo, and conſequentlie is iuſtified by a lying faith, beleeuing Chriſtes iuſtice to be his in particuler, before it vvas ſo. If *Sotc.* anſvvere, that by beleeuing it is made his in particuler, nether ſo can he eſcape: bicauſe Chriſtes iuſtice being not his in particuler till after he hath beleeued ſo, it followeth that he beleeued ſo before it vvas ſo, and ſo is iuſtified by a falſe and lying faith: eſpeciallie faith being but an apprehenſion vvhich maketh not, but ſuppoſeth her obiect, elſe *Sotcliff* might be trulie Biſhop, by firmelie beleeuing ſo. And although *Sotcliff* by beleeuing him ſelfe to be elected and iuſt, could bee ſo, yet hovv is he aſſured that he beleeueth as he ſhould, ſeing that *Calvin* will haue him to beleeue it without al feare and ſtaggering? yea *Sotcliff* ſeing before his eyes *Zuinglius* condemned to Hel, by *Luther*, vvho yet beleeued it ſo ſurelie, that he thought *he could not be damned vnleſſe Chriſte him ſelfe vvere damned*, may haue iuſt cauſe to feare him ſelfe, eſpeciallie, holding vvith Zuinglius in the denial of the real preſence, for vvhich Luther pronounced many *Anathemes and marranathaes* againſt al Zuinglians. But this vvas ſpoken by the vvay and vppon this occaſion, that *Sotcliff* thought it ſtraunge that wee

aboue.

should pray to Saincts being not yet assured of our owvn sanctitie.

3. As for prayer made to Saincts, I haue aboue proued it at large out of Scriptures and Fathers, and therfore shal not here need to enter into that discourse again: only here I will demaund of our Minister why wee may not pray to Saintes? ether it is bicause it is Idolatrie and iniurious to Christ, or bicause they can not heare vs, or can not helpe vs, or vvill not help vs. not for the first, bicause vvee call not on them as God, no nor as principal mediatours or intercessors, (for so vvee call only on Christe) but only secodarie Intercessours and freindes of God, vvhich is no more derogating to Christe, then to pray (as vvee doe) in the same manner to the Saincts if this life. Yea this intercession to Saincts as freindes, being an honour to them, must needes redound to Christe him selfe, no othervvise then sutes, vvhich are made to the kinges freindes & officers, are made in effect to the King, and redound also to his honour. Not for the second, bicause aboue in the last Chapter of the 3. booke I haue proued, that they heare vs. not for the third, bicause Angels can helpe vs, eue in this kinde, as in the same place is shevved by the *Angel Raphael*: and vvhy then can not Saincts, vvhoe, many of them haue greater grace and glorie, and consequently are in greater credit vvith God then many angels, & so are better able also by their prayers to helpe vs? not for the fourth, bicause their charitie is no lesse then the charitie of Angels, and Saincts of this life,

Supra.

yea it is greater then liuing Saincts charitie, and so they can be noe lesse prone and willing to help vs. Vvherfore *S. Hierom* thus argueth against *Vigilantius*, and I vvill thus conclude vvith him: *Si Apostoli & martyres adhuc in corpore constituti? &c.* *If the Apostles and martyrs yet constituted in this bodie, can pray for the rest, vvhen they must as yet be sollicitous for themselues, hovv much more after their crovvnes, victories, and triumphes? One man Moyses, obteineth pardon for six hundred thousand armed men, and after he hath began to liue vvith Christe, shal he be lesse able? Paule the Apostle sayth, that tvvve hundred seuentie six soules vvere giuen him* (that is saued for his sake and prayers) *and after that being resolued, he hath begun to bee vvith Christe, shal he then shut his mouth, and shal not be able to open it for those, vvhoe in the vvhole vvorld haue beleeued his Ghospel? and shal Vigilantius a liue dogge, bee better then that dead lion?* Hierom. l. cont. vigilant. Exod. 32. Act. 27. Eccles. 9.

## Sotcliff.

27. *They ouerthrovv the grounds of Artes and rules of reason and sence, Where they teach, that Christes bodie and bloud is reallie in the Sacrament. &c.*

## Kellison.

1. OVr minister hauing made remonstraunce of his diuinitie, novv endeuoureth to shevv him selfe an Artisan and Philosopher. he saith Catholikes holding the real præsence, do ouer-throvv the groundes of Artes, reason, and sense. And vvhat Artes are those I pray you? he

nameth onlie *Arithmetike*, and so vseth the plural number for the singuler. And how dovvee ruinate *Arithmetique?* bicause, saith he, *reason and Arithmetique teache vs, that many vnities make a number, and that one and one make tvvoe. But this ground the Papists destroy. for albeit vpon this Altar is one bodie, and at the same tyme another vpon another, yet do they deny that in this case one and one make tvvoe.* This *Arithmetician* is as wise as the Scholler of Oxford, vvho would proue tvvoe egges three, by counting one, tvvoe, and then subsuming, one and tvvoe make three. But I answer, that I graunt that many vnities make a number, but deny that in diuers Altars are diuers bodyes. Vvheras he subsumeth that one and one by *Arithmeticke* do make, tvvoe, I deny this *Arithmeticke*. becausse one and one may be affirmed of the same thing in diuers tymes or places, and so one & one make not tvvoe, only one and another doth soe. For there is one God in the Father, one God in the sonne, one God in the holy Ghost: and the Father is one God, the sonne is one God, the Holy Ghost is one God, and yet not three Goddes but one. There is one soule in *Sotcliffes* heele, one soule in his head, and yet not tvvoe soules but one, yea one and the same in his heele and head and al partes of his bodie. And
1. Cor. 15. there is one body *corruptible*, vvhich dyeth, one body *spiritual* and *incorruptible* vvhich riseth, and yet not tvvoe but one and the selfe same bodie. And so there is one body of Christe in this Altar, one in that Altar, and yet not tvvoe, but one and the selfe same bodie. So S. *Chrysostome* saith, *that vvee*

*offer the same Sacrifice, of the lamb* of God Christe Ie- Ho. 17.
sus, *and not one lamb to day, another to morrow, but one* ad Heb.
*and the same, else because Christe is offered in many places, there should be many Christes.*

1. Nether do wee destroy sence. yes but you do, saith *Sotcliff*, bicause *sense teacheth that wee receive bread and wine, but yee will haue vs rather to beleeue the Pope then our owne senses.* I answer that sence is neuer deceued in his propre obiect, if the *organ*, and *medium*, be wel disposed, and the obiecte bee placed in a proportionate distaunce. Wherfore, that a staffe which is halfe in the water, halfe a boue it, seemeth broken, the reason is, bicause the *medium* is not the same: and when wee vse spectacles which make thinges seem bigger then they are, or looke thorow redde glasse which maketh that which is blacke to seeme redd, the cause of the decept is, the indisposition of the *medium*, thorough which wee looke. So al square thinges, a farre of seem round, bicause the litle corners not mouing the sight so farr of, the rest seemeth round: so the moone seemeth no greater then a cheese, the starres no bigger then litle cãdles, which yet in quantitie surpasse the wholle earthe, bicause they being so farre of, do send weake *species* to our eyes, and so seeme so litle. But if the organe be wel disposed, the *medium* apte and æqual, as the ayre moderatelie illumina- Ar. l. 2. de
ted is, the obiect nether to neere nor farre of: *sence* anima ca.
*neuer erreth.* And so nether are our sences deceued 6. text 63.
in the B. Sacrament. Bicause the sences iudge l. 3. de ani-
only of the Accidentes, and formes of bread and ma c. 3 tex
161.

vvine, not able to reach to the substannce, that being in it selfe not sensible: & seing that, though the substaunce of bread bee chaunged into Christes body, and the substaunce of vvine into his bloud (as aboue I haue proued) yet the Accidentes remaine the same: noe meruail if the eye see vvhite and round as before, the tongue tast, the nose smel, the hand feele as before. But saith *Sotc.* sence iudgeth it to be bread, and so if it bee not bread, sence is deceued. I answer him that vvhilest he pleadeth for sence, he reasoneth against reason and *Philosophie*, vvhich teach that only the accidentes are sensible not the substaunce, and so senses nether before nor after *Transubstantiation* do iudge bread to be there, but onlie that there is the colour, sapour, and other accidentes of bread, which being the same both before and after *Transubstantiation*, sence iudging of them as before, is not deceued. Onlie the deceipt that is, is in the vnderstanding, vvhich being informed by sence that the accidētes of bread are there, doth thence inferre that the Substaunce (vvhich ordinarilie is vnited to th' Accidents) is also there: vvhich illation also is ordinarilie true. but bicause faith, yea Christe telleth vs, that by *Transubstātiation*, the substaunce of bread is chaunged into the body of Christe (vvhich aboue I haue proued) therfore the Catholike by faith, correcteth his vnderstanding, and saith vvith blind *Isaac*, although the vnderstanding followving sense iudgeth that here is the substaunce of bread and vvine, yet faith telleth that here is the voice of Iacob, that is of Chri-

Mat. 16.

ſte, that calleth it his body: vvhich voice is to be credited before our eyes and ſences. Only *Sotcliff* and his conpanions and other infidels, vvho goe no father then ſence, are deluded and deceued, not in their eyes, or taſt, or fealing, but in their vnderſtanding. But if they did beare that reſpect to Chriſte, vvhich his veritie in vvordes, and omnipotencie in deedes requireth, they vvould credit his voice and vvorde, eſpeciallie interpreted by the Church *the piller of truth*, and his *Spouſe* alſo vvho is moſt familiarlie acquainted vvith his ſecret meaninges. *S. Cirill* of *Hieruſalem*, relyed more on this voice then on his ovvn ſenſes, and biddes al Chriſtians ſo to doe. *Quamobrem non ſic hæc attendas velim* (ſaith he) *tanquam ſint nudus et ſimplex panis, corpus enim ſunt et ſanguis Chriſti. nam etiamſi ſenſus illud tibi renunciat, fides tamen te confirmet. &c. Vvherfore I vvould not haue theto eſteem of theſe thinges, as if they vvere naked bread, for they are the bodie and bloud of Chriſte. for although ſence telleth thee that, yet let faith aſſeram thee vvithout al doubt, that thou art made vvorthie to be made partaker of the bodie and bloud of Chriſte. knovving and holding for certain, that this bread (ſo he calleth it for the external ſhovv) vvhich is ſeen of vs is not bread but the bodie of Chriſte, and that the vvine vvhich vvee ſee, although to the taſt it ſeeme vvine, yet it is not vvine but the bloud of Ghriſte* S. *Chryſoſtome* giues vs the ſame counſel, and biddes vs to beleeue God, although ſenſe teach vs othervviſe, and eſpeciallie in theſe myſteries of th' *Eucharift*: for, ſaith he, *verbis illius deſraudari non poſſumus, ſenſus verò noſter*, &c. *by his vvordes vvee can not be deceiued, but our ſence* is Mat.

Ciril. Catech. 4. myſtag.

Paulò infia.

Chriſ. hom 83.

*is easilie deceaued. Seing that he therfore, hath sayd, this is my body, let vs not doubt of it, but let vs beleeue it.*

3. *Sotcliff* addeth, *that Philosophie teacheth vs that no bodie can come to a place or go awaie vvithout local motion. But these teach that Christes bodie beginneth to be in the Sacrament, and departeth again from thence, the formes being corrupted, vvithout local motion.* I answver that this may bee against his *Philosophie*, but not against true *Philosophie*: as I shall make him to knovv by many examples. For vvhen *Sotcliff* himselfe vvas conceaued in his mothers vvomb by perfect conception, he began to bee there present, vvithout al local motiō, and when he shal dy on his bedde or other place, vvee may say *Sotcliff* is gone, and is no more here, and yet vvithout local motion. And vvhen Christe turned vvater into vvine, the vvater departed, that is remained noe more in the pottes, and yet vvithout local motion: and the vvine came thether, that is began to be præsent there, and yet vvithout local motion. *S. Thomas* of *Aquin* and the Thomists, vvho hold that Angels are in place by operation, vvould say that the Angel that novv is in a Chamber, if he cesse from operation, shal be no more there, though he depart not by local mutation. If *Sotcliff* in *Ireland* or at *Cales*, had come so neare blovves (though I thinke he kepte *Thrasies* place, behind and farre of) as to haue had an arme or a legge cut of: his soule should haue left his arme, and yet vvithout local motion: for it could not haue retired it selfe inwardlie to the bodie, it being there before. Lastlie When God framed Adam of a peece of clay, Adam

Tho. 1. p. q. 52. a. 1.

began to bee in the vvorld, vvhere before he vvas not, and yet vvithout local motion, and vvhen Adam dyed, he left the vvorld, and yet vvithout local motion. In like manner then Christes bodie by *Transubstantiation* of bread into it, presenteth it selfe vnder the formes of bread, and yet vvithout local motion: and vvhen the formes of bread are corrupted, Christes body cesseth to be there, bicause it looseth his Sacramental being, and yet without local motion. And *Sotcliff* if he had beene a *Philosopher*, might haue knovvn, that though no bodie can come to a place locallie, nor departe locallie vvithout local mutation (bicause that implieth a cõtradiction) yet a bodie may bee in place vvhere before it vvas not, by creation, generatiõ, and Transubstantiation, and it may leaue the place, that is, it may cesse to bee there, by annihilatiõ corruptiõ, or by loosing onlye his local, or Sacramental existence: as Christes bodie doth, vvhen the formes of bread and vvine are corrupted.

## Sotcliff.

28. *All Christians beleeue that Christe is the Redeemer of the vvorld &c.*

## Kellison.

HOvv *Catholiques* make Christe the sole Redeemer, and how your doctrine makes him an absurd, yea no Redeemer, you haue hard aboue, to vvhich place I remit you for your ans- aboue l. 3. c. 2. 3.

vver. Vvheras you obiect that in the *Masse*, the Priest saith, *Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu &c. vppō vvhich* (hostes) *vouch safe to cast thyne eyes vvith a merciful and serene countenaunce:* I answver that by those wordes, the Priest prayeth not that Christes body and bloud may in them selues bee acceptable, bicause so they are most pleasing & gratefull, but only that they may bee acceptable for vs. And doth not *Sotcl.* knovve, that a thing may in it selfe bee vvorthie, and yet not accepted as vvorthie? Certes if he should offer a 1000 *pounder* for a peece of land that lyeth neere vnto him, and commodiously for him, he might offer more then the ground is vvorth, and yet might pray also the Landlord to accept it. A nother speech yet there remaineth, vvhich scandalizeth this vveake brother, to vvit, that the Priest in the Masse prayeth that *he vvill commaund these* (that is the bodie and bloud of Christe) *to be caryed vp to Gods high Altar by the handes of his Angel.* I answver, that *Sotc.* seemeth novv deuoid of Spirit, that vnderstandeth these vvordes so materiallie, & literallie vvhich should be interpreted spirituallie. For the Priest meaneth not that an Angel should carye Christes body & bloud into heauen reallie, for hovv then should he communicate? but only he prayeth that by the assistaūce and prayers of Angels, the sacrifice may be præsented to God as gratfull and acceptable, not in it selfe, but for them for whom it is offred. So that *Sotcliff* hath sought for a knob and knot in a Bulrush, and findeth a fault in these vvordes in vvhich Antiquitie found none at al: although

God

Celestin Pope, Isidorus Hispalensis, the Authour of the Romain Order, Amalarius, Rabanus, Strabo, Micrologus, Ruperius, Hugo de Sancto Victore, Innocentius the third, S. Bonaventure, Wilhelmus Durand, Thomas of Walden, haue written of the office, ceremonies, and prayers of the Masse, and S. Ambrose twelue hundred yeares agone, makes mention in particuler of that part of the Masse, and findeth no fault, where Sotc. hath espied blasphemie.

Ex Ioan. Dia. in vita Greg. lib. 2 c. 17. Greg l. 7. ep. 63. Amb. lib. 4. de sacr. cap. 5. 6.

SOTCLIFF.

29. They beleeue that their soules are redeemed by Masses &c.

KELLISON.

TO this also aboue I haue answered, that Wee beleeue Christes death and the Sacrifice of the crosse to bee our only Redemption, the Masse and Sacramentes, do only applye this Redemption.

SOTCLIFF.

30. They destroy Christes Priesthood and that twoe Wayes. First as if he had offered no perfect sacrifice for mannes sinne, they continuallie offer sacrifices for quicke and dead. Secondly as if his prayer were not hard they runne to our Ladie &c.

KELLISON.

WVee destroy Christes Priest-hood nether wayes. For wee offer daylie sacrifice to ma-

ke Christe an æternal Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, and to hold vp Religion vvhich can not stand vvithout Sacrifice, as vvee shall see herafter. Vvee acknovvledge also the Sacrifice of the Crosse a most sufficient price of our redeption, & therfore Wee offer not the Sacrifice of the Masse to make the price greater, but only to apply it by the Masse, as vvee do also by Sacramentes, and obseruation of the law. Or if bicause the Sacrifice of the Crosse was of it selfe sufficient *Sotcliff* vvill haue no application, he must condemne his faith and Sacramentes, and al good vvorkes, for feare least any one turn his argument against him, and say: You teach that faith is necessarie, yea some of you teach that Baptisme, and the obseruation of the 10 commaundementes are also necessarie, *as though Christe had offered not perfect Sacrifice for mannes sinne.* Vvee pray to Saintes also, not because Christes prayer vvas not sufficient, but to applye Christes passion and prayer vvhich as he vvould not haue to be auaileable for vs vvithout Sacramentes and prayer to God, so nether vvithout prayer to Saintes of this and the next life. And doth not *Sotcliff* see that this his argument, if it were vvorth any thing, would conclude against *S. Paule*, Vvho commended him selfe to the Christians prayers, yea against him selfe vvho though Christes prayers be sufficient, vvill not disdayne to pray him selfe, and to desire the prayers of his Bishops and Ministers. Yea thus hee condemneth al morning and euening prayer, in his owyn church, bea it sette, as the protestaun-

Rom. 15. Eph. 6. Heb. 3. et vlt.

tei, or vnſette, as the puritanes vvil haue it, bicauſe Chriſtes prayer vvas ſufficient.

SOTCLIFF.

31. *They denie Chriſt to remain a Prieſt for euer after th'order of Melchiſedech vvhen they teith that their Maſſe-Prieſts are after th'order of Melchiſedech. &c.*

KELLISON.

RAther you by denying Chriſte to haue offered the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, & cõmaunded cõtinualie the ſame to be offered, do deſpoile him of this æternal prieſt-hood, as aboue is proued. our Maſſe prieſtes are Chriſtes vnder Priests and ſo do not take from him his Prieſthood, but do continevv it, bicauſe he offereth by them: as he baptiſed by his Apoſtles: he him ſelfe by him ſelfe offereth noe more Sacrifices, though he alvvayes cõmend vnto his father his former ſacrifice euen of the croſſe. Aug. trãſ. 1. in Io.

SOTCLIFF.

32. *They deny Chriſte to be the only head, foundation, and teacher of his Church &c.*

KELLISON.

IF you had any vvit in your head, you vvould not triſle out the tyme vvith ſuch argumentes vvhich are alreadie anſvvered, and conclude as

vvel against you. for although Christe be the only supreme head and fondation and teacher, yet you make the King Suprem head of the Church of Ingland, and you make your Ministers teachers. As for Traditions, vvee æqualize diuine traditions to Scriptur, bicause *verbum traditum and Scriptum* are of the same authoritie, and as true it is gods vvorde and as surelie to bee beleeued, that S. Mathevvs Ghospel is scriptur, vvhich yet is not vvritten but deliuered, as that the contentes are true vvhich are vvritten. Yet Apostolical, and Ecclesiastical Traditions and Popes decretalles, vvee hold to bee as farre inferiour to scriptur, as mennes vvordes though gouerned by the Spirit of God, are to gods vvord.

SOTCLIFF.

*Finallie no man can talke more vvickedlie and dishonorablie of Christes person and offices, then Kellison. &c.*

KELLISON.

IN vvhat I beseech you? in many thinges, sayth he. And then he setteth dovvn a beadrolle of blasphemies. As that I sayd *the vvord vvas mute*, that Christe *vvith one vvord or teare* might haue redeemed vs: that Christes passion vvas not *our formal iustification or satisfaction*, but only the *meritorum cause*: that vvee *cooperate vvith Christes grace, to our saluation*: That Saincts are *mediators of intercession*: that the *seuen Sacramentes do giue grace*: that Priests absolue

*sowe sinnes*: that there is *Purgatorie* and *Indulgences*: that Christe is a *Iesu maker*: that he hath many vicegerentes: that the Popes *Iudgement* in matters of faith is *infallible*: that he is *head* of the Church: that by the prouerb *Loue me loue mine*, I proue Saintes must be honoured. But to al these, I haue al eadie answered him in diuers places. Only there is one great matter vvhich he imputeth not to mee, but to the *Glosse* vpon the *Extrauagant*, *Vnam*, *Sanctam*: vvhich saith, *non videtur dominus discretus fuisse vt cum reuerentia eius loquar, nisi post se talem vicarium reliquisset*, &c. *our Lord had not seemed to be discret (that I may speake vvith his reuerence) if he had not left such a vicar after him*, to vvit, vvho should gouern his Church, and controlle Princes that vsurp vpon the Church. Vvhere vvee see, that he saith not, that Christe vvas indiscret, as *Caluin* sayth he vvas inconsiderate, and both he and *Sotcliff* say he vvas ignoraunte, but only that *he should haue seemed indiscret* (vvhich also he saith not, but vvith his reuetence) if he had left his Church vvithout a visible head, and had giuen her no Iudge but scriptur, vvhich is ambiguous and obscure, and euerie ones priuat spirit, vvhich is vncertain. And certes hovv inconuenient this had been, aboue vvee haue seen: and bicause it is inconeenient Christe hath not done it, yea he could not do it, bicause he can not do but that vvich is conuenient. But suppose the *Glosse* had erred, yet *Sotcliff* that taketh vppon him to Survey our Religion, should haue made a difference betvviat the glosse and the lavv. And thus vvee see the great blasphemies against

De maiorit. & obedient.

aboue fol. 275.

aboue bo. ke

Christe, his twoe natures, and offices, al answered: and what Sotcliff thereby hath gained, he may put in his eyes, and see neuer the worse.

KELLISON.

# THE TITLE OF THE FOVRTH BOOKE.

*The fourth booke conteineth a Survey of their Religion, and worship of God.*

## The somme of the first chapter.

THE old law being abrogated, a new Priest-hood was to be established, because the Translation of the law and Priest-hood, both in the law of nature and of Moyses, and of Christe, euer went together. Christe in the new law was the sole high Priest, the Apostles and their lawfull successors, are his vnder Priests and vicegerentes: as is proued by

Scriptures, in vvhich is frequent mention of Priests, and by Ignatius and the canons of the Apostles and the Councel of Nice. Those Priests vvere ordained by imposition of handes by Bishops, that lavvfullie succeeded th' Apostles, as al ecclesiastical histories and practise of the Church doth vvitnesse. But the ministers of the nevvv Church are not true Priests, bicause they offer no true and proper sacrifice, and are neither lavvfully ordained nor called as is proved (vvhich also they seem to confesse, in saying al are Priests a like, and in traslating elders for Priests) ergo they are no true Priests, & consequentlie haue noe Religion, bicause Priests and Religion in al lavves, euer vvent together.

Act. 1. 14. & 20. 1. Tim. 4. 5. 2. Tim. 1. Tit. 1. Isac. 5. Ignat. ep. ad Eph. ep. ad Tral. ep. ad Ant. Cā. Apost. can. 1. 2. & seq. Conc. Nic. can. 3. 4. Luth. de abrogāda missa priuata.

*Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.*

Sotcliff being Spent and vvearied out, vvith so many vvrestlinges, strugglinges, foyles and falles; and perceiuing vvhat litle good successe he hath had in his encounters, henceforth flyeth the combate, that is answvereth not, but only denyeth al that commeth in his vvay. And although in deed the reason is, bicause he can not answver, yet he pretendeth another reason, to vvit, bicause *I do nothing in that vvhich followeth, but lye like a Sycophant, and vayle like a scurrilous, and*

*graceles companion, deuoyd of reason and honestie.*

Sotcliff chap. 7. And so saith he, *I will truusse vp this great fardle of foolerie, vvith in the compasse of a fevv leaues. If any thing I leaue, it shall not faile to haue answer, God willing, if he can and will note the default.* But vvhether this be a iust reason or noe, let the Reader bee Iudge, vvho hath perused my Surucy, and shal peruse my Replye. As for his answer, if he take from vs lyes, and raylinges, and scoffinges and impertinent speeches, and obiections vvhich are vsed insteed of answeres, he might crusse all vp in soe litle a fardle, that the bearer of it should be litle burdened. As touching his promise to answer hereafter vvhat novv he leaueth vnanswvered, I deliuer him of that paine, bicause he hauing answered to no one argument as yet, must make a nevv and a total answer, vvhich vvould be to much paynes for him; and I am so in loue vvith this answvere, that I promise him neuer to reply, though he answvere a thousand tymes. But let vs see vvhat he answvereth. *His first bolt* (saith he) *against our Religion is this*: you haue no true Priests, *ergo* no Religion: *But his Antecedent is false.* If it be false, proue then your selues to be true Priests? *If by Priests* (sayth he) *you mean true Bishops and Pastours, that in-*

*he preach the vvorde and sincerlie administer the holy Sacramentes according to Christes Institution, then haue vvee such.* Here vvee see, that he proueth his ministers true Priests, bicause they preach and minister sacramentes conformable to the vvord: vvhich his answer if it be admitted, al heretikes will proue them selues true Priests, vvho al say, they preach conformablie to the vvord. yea then *Sorcliffe* vvife, shalbe as good a Priest as hee, if shee preach and minister Sacramentes as he and his doe, that is (as they say) conformablie to the vvord. But this his answer is alreadie in the first chapter of my first booke of *Reply*, reiected as absurd. And so, as there is shewe fol. proued, if his ministers bee Priests, they must shevv their ordination and vocation: which being they can not (as is there demonstrated) it followeth that in their Church are noe true Priests, vvhich *Luther* confesseth saying, *that no visible priest-hood is in the new Testament.* And so amongest them can bee no true vvorshipp of God nor Religion, bicause vvhere noe true Priests are, there can be no true administration of Sacramentes, nor lavvfull preaching of Gods vvord, and consequently nether true vvorshipp of God, nether true faith, nor Religion.

Luth. l. de abrogan. missa.

## The Somme of the second chapter.

Plut. ad uers. Colot. lib. & ad potest sanae vi sectũ. Epic. Gen. 4.17.1.Par. 15. Dan. 2. 12. malach 1. Mat. 26. Luc. 22. 1. Cor. 10. Aug. l. 10. civit. cap. 3. l. 22. c. quit. ca. 22. Arnob. in psal. 109. Hier ep. ad Marcel.

THat a Sacrifice in al lawes hath alwayes been counted necessarie to vphold Religion this chapter proueth at large by prophane Autours, Scriptures, and reason: because Sacrifice being an honour giuen onlie to God, if that be taken away, not onlie the principal, but also proper external worship of God is abolished, and so Religion ruined. And so as in the lawe of natur, and in the lawe vvritten there vvere sacrifices, so must there be in the newe lawe. And seing that the sacrifice of the crosse can not bee repeated: besides that, another proper sacrifice (for prayer and thanksgiuing being improper sacrifices are not sufficient) is necessarilie to be continued in the Church of Christ, that the people vvith the Priest may bee assembled at it, and there professe their Religion and continue the vvorship of God. This sacrifice is the sacrifice of the Masse, as is proued by Scriptures and fathers, vvhich the reformers do al reiect: and seing that they name no other proper sacrifice, it followeth that they haue no external and proper vvorship of God, and so no religion, because sacrifice and religion euer go together.

Sotcliff answereth that *my second bolt is levelled at their religion verie levvdly* and he giues his reason: *for it toucheth not vs that haue not only the sacrifices of prayse and thankesgiuing and al other spirituall sacrifices, but also the commemoration of Christes onelie sacrifice once offered on the crosse, & daylie celebrated in the Holy Eucharist.* But none of these, not th'Eucharist it selfe in your opinion, being the sacrifice vvhich *Daniel* saith *Antichrist* shal take avvay, nor the sacrifice which *malachie* saith shal be offred euerie vvhere (bicause they speake of a proper sacrifice and therfore oppose it to proper sacrifices, these are al in your opinion improper, they speake of one sacrifice, these are many, and of a sacrifice vvhich is proper to the nevv lavv, these are common to al lavves, as I had told you) and you naming no proper sacrifice in your Church nor answvering any thinge vvhich I had not reiected, I may still conclude as I did, that you haue no religion, bicause true and proper sacrifice and religion, do euer goe together, This Minister speeding so ill in his answveres, betaketh him selfe (as his manner is) to obiections. If there bee no religion (saith he) vvhere there is no reall and external sacrifice, then haue the Papistes

no religion. And how proue you that? first (saith he) because *Bellarmine li. 1. de Missa c. 2. saith that in a true sacrifice it is required that the thinges offered be destroyed* &c. To this aboue you are answered as aboue you obiected the same. *Secondly* (saith Sotc.) *that sacrifice which the Masse-Priests offer is a meare fancy.* But this being a meare affirmation, and no proofe, needeth no answer. They alledge saith he some wordes of the institution of the Eucharist, *of Daniel and Malachie, but they fit not the impure Masse.* This also is a bare affirmation without proofe. The fathers also (saith hee) *were ignorant of the Histrionical sacrifice* (so this vice calleth it) *of Masse-Priests.* This also should haue been proued. *I haue proued it* (saith he) *in my bookes de Missa against Bellarmin.* nether in this do I beleeue you vnlesse I see your proofes. And can you proue that Sir Minister, who as yet haue nether proued nor disproued any thing? Why then did you not answere my proofes in this chapter and aboue in the Sixt chapter of the third book, & in the eight booke seuenth chapter? But although not only in these places of my *Survey*, but also aboue in this my replye, both by scripture, reason and fathers, I haue demonstrated this

aboue fol. 315.

aboue fol. 26.

sacrifice: yet bicause you so bodelie say, as a boue also you sayd, that the Fathers knevv not this sacrifice, I vvill proue it as plainlie out of them, as any other mysterie of faith can be proued. And first let th'anciēt Popes speake who were good and lawfull Popes & not as yet by your confession metamorphized into Antichrist. *Anacletus* cōmaundeth Bishops and *Priests not to sacrifice without witnesses*, nor vvithout deacons to assiste. *Sother* Pope, cōmaundeth tvvoe at least to be præsent, bicause the priest saith *Dominus vobiscū*, and *Orate pro me*. *Euaristus* Pope, vvilleth that places vvherin *Masse* is sayd, *bee consecrated*, *Altars bee sacred vvith Chrisme and the Bishops Benediction*. *Pius* Pope the first of that name, telleth hovv, *Eutropia* hauing giuen her hovvse to the poore, he celebrated *Masses there with the said poore Christians*, & he enioineth a pænaunce to the priests that shal spil any of the contents in the Chalice. Clemēs ye first Pope of that name forbiddeth to say Masse in other places then the Bishop shal assigne. vvhich testimonies the *Magdeburgians* can not tel hovv to answver, then by reiecting these Epistles, which yet *Turianus* hath proued to be theirs and as ancient as they. *S. Gregories* testimonie we haue seen a-

fol 16.

Anacl. ep. 1. c. 2.

Soter. de cōsec. d. 2.

Euarist. apud Burch l. 2. c 37.

Pius ep. 2 apud bibl. t.

Clemens ep. 3.

Dio. Areo. l. de Eccl. Hier. c. 3. boue. *Dionisius Areopagita* makes mẽtion of the manner of celebrating these mysteries and of diuers ceremonies therin obserued.

Hip l. de consum. mundi & Antichrist. *Hippolitus* saith, *Iugebunt Ecclesiæ luctum magnum quia nec oblatio nec suffitus fiet &c.* The Church shal mourne vvith great lamentation because nether oblation nor incense shalbe made (to vvit in the tyme of Antichriste) *nor vvorship grateful to God: but Churches shalbe desolate like to a shepheards cottage, and the pretious bodie and bloud of Christe in those dayes shal not be extaunt, the liturgie (or Masse) shalbe extinguished, singing shal cease.* Tertulian saith, *wee Christians*

Tert. l. ad Scap. c. 2. *sacrifice for the health of th' Emperour, but to him that is both his God and ours.* S. Ignatius before

Ign. ep. ad Ephes. ep. ad Rom. him sayth, *nemo erret: nisi quis intra septa Altaris sit, priuetur pane Dei: let no man deceue him selfe: vnless he bee vvithin the præcinctes of the Altar, let him be depriued of the bread of God.* Vvhich bread he calleth *heauenly bread vvhich is the flesh of Christe.* Bread, bicause of the external formes, heauenlie bread, bicause of Christe conteined, called in S. Ihons Ghospel *liuing bread.*

Io. 6. In his Epistle to the Philadelphiãs hee exhorteth them to *vse one faith, one preaching, one Eucharist, bicause there is one flesh of our Lord Iesus Christe and one bloud that vvas sheed for vs, and one challice, vvhich vvas*

*distributed for vs al, one bread vvhich vvas broken for al, one altare.* In his Epistle to the *Smyrnians* he speaketh yet more plainlie: *non liceat Episcopo &c. let it not be lavvfull vvithout the Bishop to baptise, nor offer, nor immolare sacrificium, immolate sacrifice.* Vvhich vvordes are so playn that the *Magdeburgians* can not auoyd them but by reiecting the *Epistle. Irenæus* sayth *Priests do alvvayes serue God and the Alter:* and that *God vvil haue them offer their guift at the Altar vvithout intermission.* He addeth that Christe at his last *Supper, nouum testamenti nouam docuit oblationem quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in vniuerso mundo offert Deo, taught a nevv oblation, of the nevv Testament, vvhich the Church receiuing from th' Apostles offereth in the vvholle vvorld to God.* And this *oblation*, and guift, he calleth *purum sacrificium a pure sacrifice*, vvhich vvordes added to the vvordes, *Priest*, and *Altar*, can not but signifie a true and proper sacrifice, for vvhich only, Priests haue euer been instituted and altars erected, and neuer for thankes giuing, prayse of God and such in proper sacrifices vvhich vvemen may offer as vvel as men and lay men as vvel as Priests, and in their chamber and on their bedde, and at their Tables, vvithout, al Churche and Altar.

Magdeb. cent 2. c 4 Tit de ritibus circa cœnam. Iren l. 4. c. 20. 32. 34.

These vvordes of Ireneus are so playn, that the *Magdeburgians* say he spake *negligently and improperlie*, as one careles of his speech. *Iustinus Martyr*, relateth hovv euen in his tyme vvhich vvas in *Antoninus* th Emperours tyme, Christians met secretly at prayer (as now they doe in England) and hovv the Priest taking *bread, and vvine mixt vvith vvater, offereth prayse and glorie by the Eucharist*; he mentioneth also *the deacons distributing the sacred bread to the people present, and carying it to the absent.* Vvhich *bread and drinke*, he saith, is not common bread and drinke, but as by the *vvord of God Christe had flesh and bloud for our Salvation, so vvee are taught that that nurriture, in vvhich prayers of his vvord proceding from him are sayed and thanges giuing made, &c. is the flesh and bloud of the incarnate Iesus.* And in his *Dialogue* he sayth expresselie that the *oblation of simila* fine meale, *vvas a figur of the Eucharist vvhich succeeded to al the Iewish sacrifices, as Malachie fortold. Origen* sayth it *seemeth to pertain only to him to offer vnge sacrificũ, the continual sacrifice, vvho hath denoted him self to perpetual Chastitie. Eusebius Cæsariensis discourseth at large of this sacrifice.* So doth S. *Cirill* of *Hierusalem* vvhere he calleth it *spirituale sacrificium, spiritual sacrifice*, by reason of the

Magdeb. cent. 2. c. 4 Tit. de ritib. eccles. Iust. orat. ad Anton.

Dial. cum Typhon.

Malach. 1. Orig. l. 8. cõt. Celsũ. Euseb. l. 1. de demõst. Euang. c. 10. Cirl. cat. 4 mystag.

the body of Christe vvhich is spiritualized by the diuinitie, and, is spiritual in deed though not in substance, yet in qualitie and manner of existence: he calles it also *cultus incruentus, vnbloudie vvorship, hostia propitiationis, th' Hoste or Sacrifice of propitiation, Holie and dread sacrifice of the Altar*, vvhich he saith is offred *pro communi Ecclesiarum pace, for the common peace of the Churches*, and for the dead, as *a most great helpe of their soules, maximum animarum iuuamen*. Yea he saith expresselie that this sacrifice *is not bread, etsi gustus panem esse sentiat sed corpus Christi*, although taste iudge it bread, but the body of Christe. *Saint Hierom* saith *that if it be cõmaunded to the laymen to abstein from their vviues for prayer, quid de Episcopo, sentiendum est, qui quotidie pro suis, populique peccatis illibatas deo oblaturus est victimas? Vvhat shal vve thinke of the Bishop vvho for his owvn and the peoples sinnes, offereth daylie the vndefiled and pure victimes, or sacrifices? S. Austin* saith *this sacrifice of Christes body succeedeth to al the Sacrifices of* Ievves. I can not omit that he recounteth hovv he being absent, his priests vvere desired to send one to a hovvse haunted by deuilles, to make them to depart by his prayers: and saith *S. Austin, vnus obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi rogans quan-*

Hieron in cap. 1. ad Tit. The like testimonie he hath ep. 150. ad Hedib. q. 2.

Aug. lib. 17. ciuit. cap. 20.

lib. 22. ciuit. cap. 8.

tũ potuit vt cessaret illa vexatio &c. One (a priest) offered there the sacrifice of the bodie of Christe praying to the vttermost of his power, that the vexation might cesse, God, by and by disposing, it ces-

Conc. nic. can. 14. sed. The vvholle Councel of *Nice* in vvhich Cõstantine the Great vvas præsent, saith, nec regula &c. nether rule nor custome hath deliuered, that deacons, vvho haue no povver to offer the sacrifice, should giue it to Priests, vvho offer the bodie of Christe. To be breefe, al the Liturgies, as of the Romain Church, of vvhich S. Peter vvas compiler; of *Hierusalem*, vvhich saint Iames; of the Church of *Alexandria*, vvhich S. Marke: of th' Æthiopian Church, vvhich saint Matthevv: of the Church of *Milan*, vvhich first S. Barnabas and after S. Ambrose: of the *Cappadocian* Church, vvhich S. Basil: of the Church of *Constantinople*, which S. Chrysostome compiled: do al make mention of this sacrifice and of most of the Ceremonies and prayers of our Masse. So that Luther seing that the Christian Church, & the best and most learned Christians in al ages haue approued this sacrifice of the Masse, maketh this confession which shal hang Sotcliff: *Missa creditur passim esse sacrificiũ quod*

Luth. l. captiu. Bab. cap. *offertur Deo, accedunt his dicta sanctorũ Patrum, tot exempla, tantúsque vsus per orbem constanter*

obſeruatus: The Maſſe is euerie vvhere beleeued to bee a Sacrifice vvhich is offered to God. To theſe the ſaymgs of Fathers may be added, and ſo many exáples, and ſo great vſe obſerued cõſtantly through out the vvholle world. And in his booke de abrogãda miſſa, in the beginning, ſpeaking of this, he confeſſeth, that it is a great thing to vvreſtle aganſt the cuſtome of ſo many ages, the opinion of ſuch a multitude, and the authoritie of ſo great men. And obiecting to him ſelfe, ſayth he. Art thou only vviſe? do ſo many vvorldes erre? haue ſo many ages been ignorannt? Kemnitius confeſſeth that the Maſſe in ſaint Gregories tyme vvas as it is novv, ſince vvhich, nothing hath been added to the Canon of the Maſſe. Calum confeſſeth that the vvholle vvorld almoſt, hath been infected vvith the opinion of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe. And that al the kinges of the earth haue been inebriated vvith it. And the Liturgies yet extaunt, and the bookes of them that haue expounded and explicated the Maſſe, as Iſidorus, Amalarius, Vvalfridus, Rupertus, Innocentius the third, yea ſaint Ambroſe and ſaint Ciril of Hieruſalem: do argue, that al the vvorld, till Luther did beleeue that in the Maſſe was offred a ſacrifice. And ſo if this be idolatrie, the Apoſtles & primatiue Church, and the holieſt and lerneddſt doctours vvere

apud Bel. to. 2. l. 1. de miſſa c. 13.

Cala. l. 4. Inſtit. c. 8. §. 1.

§. 12.

Supra. fol. 319.

al damned Idolatours, and hell gates haue
Mat. 16. prævayled against the Church though *build-*
1. Tim. 3. *ded on a rocke*, and though the *piller of truth*.
And so vvee see that ether the Sacrifice of
the Masse must bee receued, or else al ancient
Fathers and antiquitie it selfe must be reie-
cted: and *Sotcliff* is ignoraunt in al antiqui-
tie to affirme, that the Fathers vvere igno-
raunt of this Sacrifice: and he maketh him
selfe vviser then *Luther*, *Kemnitius*, and *Calun*,
vvho confesse that they can not oppugne
this Sacrifice, but they must make vvarre a-
gainst all fathers, al the Christian vvorld, and
antiquitie. But although this fellovv, be not
able to answer this argument, grounded in
sacrifice, vvhich also is grounded in scriptur
(as aboue is proued) and in the practise of
Church and authoritie of Fathers: yet he
had the eyes to espie a fault in certain vvor-
des of myne, in which I say that *Christes bloud*
*in his last supper vvas povvred out for vs*: but
then, saith *Sotcl*: he offered a bloudie sacrifi-
ce. To this I answer that I sayd no more
then Christe him selfe sayd according to the
greecke ἐκχυνόμενον, which signifieth the bloud
then to haue been shed or povvred out for
vs not out of the vayne, for so it vvas shed
onlye on the crosse, but in the formes of

vvine vnder vvhich it is *powred out*, not reallie, but ſacramentallie, bicauſe vnder the formes of vvine vvhich are poured out, it is reallie giuen vnto vs.

## The Somme of the third chapter.

*Sacramentes in al lawes are and were alwayes neceſſarie to vphold Religion: in the lauve of Chriſte there are Seauen Sacramentes, as is proued by a reaſon drawn from the life and ſtate of the body, in which ſeuen thinges are neceſſarie, to which are anſvverable 7. thinges requiſit in the life and ſtate of the ſoule. Euerie one of theſe Sacramentes in particuler are proued out of Scriptur, according to th'interpretation of the Church and fathers: the ſame number is proued by the conſent of the Schoolemen and by the definitions of the* Councel *of* Florence *and Trent. The reformers vvho reiect the authoritie of the Church, & truſt only to their* wits *and priuate ſpirit, by* wh^ch *one deduceth twoe another three Sacramentes, and thoſe not the ſame haue no aſſuraunce of any Sacrament, ſcripture calling none expreſſelie Sacrament, but mariage, vvhich they al deny, and they vſing al the ſame proofe (vvhich is ſcriptur and the priuat ſpirit) to proue their diuers numbers of Sacramentes. Yea vvhileſt one denyeth the Sacramentes which ano-*

See Bel. to. 2. l. 2. de Sacram. c. 23.

*ther graunteth, they haue amongest them denyed al Sacramentes: and so haue noe religion or no certainitie of religion, hauing noe Sacramentes or no certaintie of Sacramentes, which euer went with Religion.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

1. HE will still be the same man, and bring what argumentes you will, you shall haue but one answer for al, which is a bare denial, without answer to the reason, or scripture, or Father alleaged. *Wee deny*, sayth he, *that the particuler Church of Rome is the Cath. Church. Secondlie wee affirme that the Cath. Church for a thousand yeares did neuer heare of 7. Sacraments onely and properlie so called. Thirdly it is absurd to think that the institution of Confirmation & Extreme Vnction, did as wel proceed from Christe as Baptism and the Lords Supper. Fourthlie* (saith he) *wee confesse matrimonie, orders, and repentance, haue their original from God, but neuer as Sacraments of the new Testament.* And thus with great ease, and quicke dispatch, hee will answer you any argumentes. But this denyer should remember, that it is not sufficient to deny: for so the veryest clowne that is, may defend conclusions against both th'vniuersities of Oxford and Cambridge: but he

must answere the drifte of the argument, or shew wherin it fayleth. And yet to my reason which proueth the conuenience of seuen Sacramentes, to the Scripturs by which I proue euerie Sacrament in particuler, to the Fathers alledged for *Confirmation*, *Order*, *Penaunce*, *Marriage*, and *Extrem vnctio*, which are the Sacramentes that especiallie do disgust thē, he answereth nothing. And which is worse, he sayth, *I bragge of Fathers and Scriptures, but where are they?* Wheras I haue brought Scripture for euery Sacrament in particuler, and fathers also for the fiue Sacramentes named, but do bragg of none. But he would haue the Reader, that shal not come so eaſilie to the sight of my book, as he may of his, not to meruaile at this his leane answer, seing nothing was to be answered.

2. Whereas he saith that *the Church for a thousand yeares did neuer heare of seuen Sacramentes*. I graunt it if he meane his owne Church, for that being framed out of Luthers side, whileſt he lay, not in a mystical but a mustical sleep, could not possiblie heare of them, hauing not as yet any eares to heare: but if he meane the true Church of Christe, I deny that shee was euer without seuen Sacramentes since Christe instituted them, &

th' Apostles deliuered them. For vvhen *Petrus Lombardus* six hundred yeares since, and the schoole men after him, began to handle matters of fayth Scholasticallie, therby to defēd them more easilie and solidlie against heretikes and infidelles, and amongest them determined that there vvere seuen Sacramentes: no man noted any noueltie in this doctrine, as euene one did in the doctrine of the *Hussites* and *Vvaldens*. vvhich is a signe, that before they began to treate of *seuen Sacramentes*, the doctrine vvas of ancient tyme receued in the Church: elsse then, or before, it had been noted of noueltie, and censured as heresie, as other heresies vvere. And although the ancient Fathers number not seuen Sacramentes togeather, (bicause the number being not then doubted of, they had no such occasion) yet they neuer deny seuen: & although they name sometymes but tvvoe or three, sometymes but one, yet they neuer say that there are no moe: & that they name twoe or three, it vvas vppon occasiō vvhich moued them rather to name them then others. As for example: S. Austin declaring, hovv our Sacramentes, though fevver in number then those of th' old lavv, are yet greater in force and efficacie, named

in 4. d. 2.

7. Sacramentes proued ancient.

Aug. l. 3. doctrinæ Christ. c. 9

*Baptism* and the *Eucharist* for example: *sicuti est Baptismi sacramentum & celebratio corporis & sanguinis Domini. Tertulia* disputing against *Marcion*, vvho held that this corporal world was created not of the Good, but of his imaginarie euil God, sayth that the Good God instituted oyle, bread, and vvater, as the matter of his Sacramentes, vvhich argueth that they vvere not created of the euil God, for then the Good God vvould not haue vsed them. And so hee insinuateth 5. *Sacramentes*, of vvhich these thinges are the matter. Yet the same man, vppon another occasion, to vvit bicause *Marcion* admitted none to Baptism and the *Eucharist* vnlesse they condemned marriage, in his 4. booke against *Marcion*, mentionneth only those tvvoe Sacramentes. And yet again, in another place he reckeneth 4. Sacramentes, to vvit *Baptism*, *Chrisme*, or *Confirmation*, the *Eucharist* and *Order*. Yea although the fathers name not 7. Sacramentes, yet they insinuate moe then they name. So *S. Austin* exemplyfiing in baptisme, addeth, *& si quid aliud in diuinis literis commendatur*, *and vvhat other Sacrament is commended in Scriptures.* And in another place mentioning the same tvvoe Sacramentes, he addeth, *and in other holy Sacramentes.*

Tert. l. 1. cõt. Marc.

l. 4 cont. Marcion.

Tert. l. de resur. carn.

Aug. ep. 118.

Aug. in ps. 103.

Aug. ep. 119.

And in another place, he setteth dovvn the matter of 5. Sacramentes, to vvit, *vvater, vvheat, vvine,* and *oyle.* Yea the Fathers amõgest them and in diuers places do mention al the 7. Sacramentes seuerallie. For besides Baptism and the *Eucharist*, S. *Austin* makes mention of *Confirmation* and *Order*, æqualizing them to *Baptism*. S. *Ciprian* calleth *Baptism* and *Confirmation* Sacramentes. S. *Austin* maketh *Reconciliation*, a Sacrament. *Innocentius* the first and *saint Bernard*, and S. *Chrysostome* acknovvledge *Extrem vnction* for a Sacrament. Yea *saint Austin*, holdeth Marriage also for a Sacrament, saying, that *in Christians marriages, the sanctitie of the Sacrament, is more then the fœcunditie of the vvomb.* Lastlie the Councels of *Florence* and *Trent* haue defined this number of 7. Sacramentes: and so this is as sure as other verities defined by other general Councels: bicause the Reformers of this age, can oppose no more against these Councels (they consisting of ordinarie and lavvfull Pastors, vvho can proue their ordination and vocation as vvel as the *Nicen* Bishops could, and being assembled in that Church vvhich vvas receued of al but these Reformers, yea and at the first of them also for the true Church) then the *Arrians*, *Ne-*

Aug. l. 2. cont. Lit. Petil. c. 104 l. 2. eõt. ep. Parm. c. 13 Cipr. l. 2. ep. 1. Aug. l. 5. de bap. c. 20. & in ps. 146. Innoc. ep. 1 ad Decēt. c. 8. Bern. in vita S. Malach. Chrys. l. 3. de Sacerdotio.

ſtorians, and Eutichians, could haue obiected, againſt the firſt fovvre General Councels, as aboue I haue proued.

aboue fol. 172.

## The ſomme of the fourth chapter.

*THe Reformers attribute ſo litle to Sacramentes, as they make them ſerue to litle or no neceſſarie purpoſe. for ſome make them only badges to diſtinguiſh from infidelles, others make them only ſignes to ſtirre vp faith, none graunt them vertue to produce grace in our ſoules. And ſeing that profeſſion of fayth by mouth or apparel, doth better diſtinguiſh vs then Sacramentes can do, they leauing noe external marke behinde them: and that Pictures, bookes, and ſermons, are of greater efficacie to ſtirre vp faith then Sacramentes, and that baptiſm can not haue this effect in litle Childrē, it followeth that the Church may as vvel bee vvithout Sacramentes as vvith them. Then it is proued that Sacramentes giue grace, and by ſcripturs it is proued: and if they gaue no grace, then, as good no Sacramentes as Sacramentes, and noe Sacraments, no Religion.*

Mel. in locis. cap. de ſignis et Caroliſt. ex Luth. ſer. de verbis cœnæ.

*Sotcliffes anſvver vvith the Refutation.*

1. HE anſvvereth not to the ſtirring vp of faith: only he ſaith, *no man amongeſt vs vvill ſay or euer did ſay that they ſerue*

only for signes or badges of Christianitie and haue no other vse. Then Philip Melancthon is no man amongest you. for he saith plainly: that they speake probablie, *qui symbolis seu tesseris militaribus hæc signa (Sacramenta) comparauerunt, quod essent notæ tantum, quibus cognoscerentur, ad quos pertinerent promissiones diuinæ:* who compare these signes (Sacramentes) to badges (so Thomas Thomasius Inglisheth Symbola) or markes of souldiours by vvhich, they might bee distinguished, to whom the promises do appertain. Then Carolstadius also, Luthers Absalon, and Iudas, is no bodie amongest you, though he vvere the father of the Sacramentaries, and the rebellious Absalon of Luther, for he as Luther affirmeth, vvas the Autour of this opinion. Secondly (saith he) *vvee al confesse, that God vvorketh sanctification by the Sacramentes.* I marrie do you, but how? not that you thinke Sacramentes giue grace, *ex opere operato*; but only that they stirre vp faith vvhich sanctifieth and iustifieth. Vvherfore Luther saith Baptisme iustifieth not, but only faith: and denyeth the Sacramentes to haue vertue to produce grace. Yea saith he, *nos dicimus nec noui nec veteris testamenti sacramenta, sed solam fidem iustificasse.* vvee say that nether the sacramentes of the old lavv, nether of the nevv do

Mel in locis anni 1522. cap. de signis.

Th. thomas lib. 5.

Er Luth. l. 2. ad Reg Angliæ.

Luth. ser. de verbis cœn. Hoc est corpus meum.

Luth I expli. Bab. c. de bapt. an. 1520.

Luth. assert. art. 1. an. 1521.

iustifie, but only faith. Melanchon saith that as the Apostle sayd *Circumcision is nothing, so baptism is nothing, the participation of the Table of our Lord is nothing, but they are only testes & quasi vivae vvitnesses and seales*: yea saith he, *it is good to be admonished of this thing, that sacramentes do not iustifie*. *Calum* saith that the *ancients spake to magnificently of sacraments, as though there vvere some hidden vertue in them to produce grace*, whereas they do only testifie gods good vvill to vs, and are only as earnest pennyes in contractes. And although *Calum* in other places sayth, *that sacramentes are instrumental causes of grace vvhich conteine grace*, yet he meaneth that they only are causes of grace and sanctification, bicause they stirre vp faith vvhich iustifieth, as hee him selfe explicateth. And seing that *Baptism* can not stirre vp the faith of children, it followeth that it doth not sanctifie them: and for as much as bookes, pictures, and preaching, do better stirre vp faith of Christe and is passion, in those that haue vse of reason, then Sacramentes can do, it followeth also that Sacraments (if they giue noe grace of thē selues) are litle or nothing at al required in them. And to this *Sotcliff* answereth nothing. Vvheras *Sotcliff* sayth that Papistes detract from Sacramentes in

Mel. in loc an. 1522. c. de signis.

Calu. l. 4. Inst. c. 14. §. 6.

Cal. in antidot. Icff. 7. can. 5.

rebaptising those that are baptized by them, it is as true, as his ordinarie speeches are. For vvee hold that heretikes yea Iewes may baptise truly, if they haue intention to do that which the true Church intendeth, and vse elementarie vvater and the true forme of vvordes: and so our Priests rebaptise none in Ingland that haue been baptised by ministers that vse vvater and the right vvordes. And although the Councel of *Nice* can. 12. cõmaundeth to rebaptise them that vvere baptised by *Paulianists*, yet that vvas because they vsed not the right mãner of baptizing. Lastlie Sot: sayth, that in lieu of the holy *Eucharist* vvee haue thrust into the Church the idol of the Masse. These are this Idiotes wordes. but where are his answeres to our proofes of the Masse? where are his arguments to disproue it?

## The Somme of the fifte chapter.

*THis chapter shevveth hovv in effect they take avvay baptisme and the Eucharist vvhich they admit. Luther saith milke or beare vvill suffice in baptisme, and so makes the matter of baptism doubtfull: he addeth that no forme of vvordes is necessarie: so do Caluin, Brentius and Bucer, yea Caluin thinkes a sermon best, vvithout*

Luth. in coll. Sympos. c. 17. l. capt. Bab. c. de bapt. Calu. l. 4. Inst. c. 14. § 4. Bist. Cat. cap. de bapt. Bucer in c. 16. Mat.

the ordinarie forme of vvordes: and so the forme also of baptisme is taken avvay. Luther requires actual faith euen in Children, vvithout vvhich, baptism saith he, is vvorth nothing: and seing infantes can not haue actual faith, they hauing no vse of reason, it followeth that Baptisme is not for them, or at least will not profit them. Caluin saith baptisme is noe better then S. Ihons vvashing, and he denyeth that vvomen can baptise in necessitie, and so in that necessitie deprines Childrē of baptism: he sayth Children of faithfull are sanctified vvithout baptism, by the faith of their parentes, and so to them baptism is not necessarie: The same he saith of the prædestinate. he addeth that it is not to be giuen to the reprobate or Children of infidels: and so in effect depriueth both the prædestinate and reprobate, the faithfull, and faithlesse, and al, of baptism: vvhich is to take quite avvay that so holie and necessarie sacrament. As concerning th'Eucharist Luther and Lutheran vbiquetaries, deprine vs of it, by vbiquitie, vvhich destroyeth al real manducation. Caluin makes it a bare signe, to stirr vp faith vvhich a picture doth better, and so takes from vs the crumme and pith, that is the bodie and bloud of Christe, and only leaues the crust and huske of the signe and material bread. And thus in effect they haue also taken avvay baptism and the Eucharist, vvhich they vvould seem to haue left vs, because

Luc. l. cōt. Cocleum. Calu. l. 4. Inst. c. 15. §. 20. 22. 22 l. 4. Inst. c. 16. §. 24. 25.

Calu l. 4. Inst. c. 17.

*as good neuer a whit as neuer the better: and so hauing no Sacraments, they haue no Religion.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

Sotc. answereth that by particuler mennes opinions, I must not censur their religion, which I graunt him, if they were not pillars of his Church, as aboue I haue told him, and if he and his fellowes did not al follow them in most thinges, and many of them in these thinges, yea al of them in this, that Sacraments giue no grace. Then with his wonted audacitie, he denyeth that they say as I make them to speake. *Luther* (saith he) *neuer sayd nor thought that the words of baptism may be omitted or the element of water chaunged &c.* O impudencie. did he neuer say nor think so? what then sayd he when he sayd: *Quocunque modo tradatur Baptismus &c. howsoeuer baptism be giuen, if not in the name of a man, but in the name of our lord, it trulie saueth: yea I would not doubt, but that if the baptised do receue baptism in the name of our lord, he is trulie baptised in the name of our lord, although the wicked minister baptise not in the name of our lord.* So that if the baptized intendto receue baptism in the name of God,

homil. de bapt. an. 1545 apud Bel l. 1. de Sacr. c. 21.

then

then although no person of the Trinitie, but only the name of God bee expressed, yea although the Minister should baptise in the name of *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, and *Caluin*, (who neuer aggreed) baptism should be vaild: and consequently no certain vvordes are necessarie. Did not *Luther* also, being demaunded, vvhether a man might baptise in milke or beare, vvhen vvater wanteth, answvere, that vvhat so euer may make a bath (as beare and milke may) is sufficient? Did not *Luther* say that infantes beleeue, else vvere not to be baptised, nether could be iustified bicause only faith iustifieth? did he not say: *dicimus ad baptismum infantes credere per vim verbi quo exorcizantur &c.* vvee say *infantes beleeue by the force of the vvord by vvhich they are exorcized? Doth he not againsay in the same place, asserimus paruulos prorsus non esse baptizandos, si verum est, in baptismo non credere: vvee affirm that litle children are not to bee baptized, if it bee true, that in baptism they beleeue not?* Did not *Caluin* also expresselie teach, that the childrē of faithfull are sanctified in their mothers womb, and so dying vvithout baptism may be saued? vvherin he goeth farther then the *Pelagians*, who though they sayd baptism vvas not necessarie to remit

Luther in colloq. Sympos. c. 17. apud Bel. l. 1. de bap. cap. 5. l. cap. bab. ca. de bap. apud Bel. l. 1. de Sac. bap. ca 10. lib. cont. Cocleum. an. 1523.

l. 4. Inst. c. 16. § 17. 24. 25. et in Antid. sess. 6. cap. 3.

original ſinne (bicauſe they acknovvledge no ſuch ſinne in infantes) yet they ſaid none could enter heauen vvithout it. Doth he not ſay alſo that a ſermon is neceſſarie to the *Cene*, and that vvee muſt not imagin an enchantment of vvordes murmured ouer the inſenſible creaturs, to ſuffice, as Catholikes imagin? Put on your ſpectacles and read the places quoted in the margin of the Somme of this chapter, and you ſhal ſee al the other ſayinges verified vvherwith I accuſed yout maiſters, and in them you ſhal alſo ſee your own impudencie. This is al he anſvvereth, which is noe anſwere but a bare denial: and therfore he ſupplieth his vvant in anſvvering by obiecting.

Calu. li. 4. Inſt. c. 17. §. 39. et ca. 24. §. 4.

Sotcl. obiections.

2. *Thomas Aquinas* (ſaith he) teacheth, that baptiſm may bee adminiſtred *in lixuio* in lye &c. I anſvver that he and al deuines do affirme, that true, natural, and elementaire vvater, is neceſſarie in baptiſm, and that it ſufficeth alſo in neceſſitie thought it bee not pure, ſo it remain ſtill water: vvherfore in rayn vvater, in muddie vvater, in lye, in vvater in vvhich fleſh hath been ſodden, ſo the ſubſtaunce of vvater remaineth, in Sulphurie vvaters of Bathes, baptiſme is valid, though out of neceſſitie, ſuch impure waters are not

Tho. 3. pa. q. 66. a. 4. ad 4.

The anſvver.

to be vsed. but in rose vvater and other distilled and Alchimistical vvaters, in beare or Ale, vvhich are by long seething essentialhe distinct from vvater, baptism is not true and valid. He addeth that *Dionisius Carthusianus*, saith that our Ladies name may bee added to the forme of vvordes in baptism. But the answer to this also is readie. To wit, that if the priest say, *I baptise thee in the name of the Father and the Sonne and the Holy Ghost, and the B. Virgin*, vsing the same Tenour of vvordes, hee sinneth greuously, and if he mean also to giue baptisme æquallie or partiallie in the *B. Virgins* name, as though thee vvere æqual to the diuine persons, or as though baptism had vertue as vvel from her as from the B. Trinitie, yea or receued any vertue at al from her or her name, he cõmitteth a great sacrilledge: and giueth no true baptism, bicause th'addition of her name in that sense, altereth the sense of the vvordes. but if he meane only thereby to implore her help and prayers, not for baptism, but for further ayd and assistaunce, and especiallie if he vse not her name in the same tenour, but only after the wordes of Baptisme, adde, *and our lady help thee*, then those vvordes irritate not Baptisme, bicause they alter not the

in 4. d. 3. q. 1.

See Scotus in 4. d. 3. q. 1. a. 2.

meaning, which is, that baptisme is giuen in the name of the 3. diuine persons: but yet the Priest sinneth in vsing her name in baptisme, because hee doth against the ordinarie manner, and may giue occasion of offence & scandal. *Sot.* defendeth also that *Caluin* did vvel in forbidding vvomen to baptize euen in necessitie. but, of this I haue sayd sufficiently aboue, vvhere I haue proued that in such case vvomen may baptise. And *Caluins* opiniõ herin proceedeth of another errour of his, by vvhich he is persuaded, that the Children of faithfull are sanctified by their parentes faith, and so there is no need of vvomens help in cause of necessitie, because the infant may bee saued vvithout baptism: Vvherfore *Hesshusius* relateth hovv Caluin carelessly differring to baptize an infant, it dyed vvithout baptism.

aboue fol. 247.

Hesshus. 1 coor. Calu

3. But *S. Austme* did not esteem so lightly of baptism, vvho therfore saith, *quisquis dixerit quod in Christo viuificabũtur etiã paruuli, qui sine sacramenti eius participatione, de vita exeunt, et cõtra Apostolicum prædicationẽ venit, et totam condẽnat Ecclesiam, vbi propterea cũ baptizandus paruulus festinatur et curritur, quia sine dubio creditur aliter eos in Christo viuificari omnino nõ posse: vvho soeuer shal say that euen Children that dy vvith-*

Baptism. of infan tes.

Aug ep. 28

Rom. 5. 1. Cor. 15.

*out the participation of Christes sacrament* (Baptisme) *shalbe viuificated in Christe* (as *Caluin*, *Peter Martyr*, *Bucer*, and *Zuinglius* do) *he contradicteth th' Apostolical preaching, and condemneth the vvholle Church, in vvhich they make hast & runne vvith their children that are to be baptised, bicause vvithout doubt they beleeue, that othervvise, they can not be viuificated in Christe.* And again he sayeth, *Noli credere, noli dicere, &c. do not beleeue, do not say, do not teach,* (as in England nowv they do) *that infants præuented by death, before they be baptised, can attayne to the remission of originall sinne, if thou vvilt be a Catholique.* The same say I to England, and if a subiect may be so bould vvith his soueraigne, euen to my Prince the King of England, vvho in a conferẽce said, he thought children might be saued vvithout baptisme, and that therfore it vvas not to be ministred to children in necessitie, by Midvviues. And doth not Christ him selfe say, *vnless one be borne agayne by vvater and the holy Ghost, he can not enter into the Kingdom of God?* Doth not S. *Paule* say, *that if Christ dyed for all, all vvere dead?* If then he dyed for children, they vvere dead by original sinne, and so can not be saued vnless they be borne again by vvater. They say they are saued by faith of their parents.

Calu. lib. 4. inst. ca. 16. § 24. 25. et in Antidot. ad sess 6 c. 3. Peter Mart in 1. cor. 7. Bucer in cap. 3. Matth. Zuingl. li. de vera et falsa relig. lib. 3. de orig. animæ c 9.

Io. 3.

1. Cor. 15.

Psal. 50. But was not *Dauid* the sonne of faithfull parents, and yet confesseth *he was conceiued in sinne?* or doth S. *Paule* exclude the children of the faithfull, when he sayeth *all sinned in* Rom. 5. *Adam.* And if the faith of the parents can iustify a little child, why may it not iustifie a sonne of 20. yeares? and then how could *Dauid* haue an euill *Absalon*, or a good father an euill sonne? Or if *Caluin* may vnderstand by water the holy Ghost, *Kemnitius* mortification, *Zinglius* a sermon, *Brentius* penaunce, what certaintie shall we haue of any scripture, if such glosses go for current? And if where Christ saieth we cā not be saued, vnles we be borne againe of water, it is lawfull for them to vnderstand other thinges: then when he cōmaundeth to baptize in water, and where I read that the Apostles baptized in water, I will vnderstand the places Metaphorically, and so may deny the sacrament of Baptisme to consist of true water yea of any water. But if there were no other argumēt, then that the Church hath euer holden so; it were madnes (if we beleeue *S. Augustine*) to gainsay it. If I alleaged onely the *Councell of Trent*, which hath defined Baptisme to be necessarie to free children from originall sinne, and to saue them, it were suf-

Calu. in Anti. ad sess 6 cap. 5. Kemnit. in exam. sess. 7. can 2. Zinngl in cap. 1. Marci. Brēius in ca 3 Mat. Mart 28 Marc. vlt.

Epist. 118. Concil. Trid. sess 6. c 3. sess 7. can 12.

ficiēt: becauſe (as a boue hath been ſhewed) nothing can be excepted againſt this Councell, vvhich the *Arrians* might not haue excepted againſt the Councel of *Nice*, nether could Catholiques then ſay more for that, then may be ſayed now for this. aboue fol. 127.

3. Then *Sotcliff* commeth vppon vs vvith his dogges and Cattes, which he ſaith according to our doctrine do eate the body of Chriſte. But to this he hath already receued his anſvver. This done he ſaith vvee vſe to Baptize Belles, and ſo abuſe the ſacrament of *Baptiſm*. I anſvver, that as belles to fooles, do ring in that tune, vvhich they imagin, ſo to our *Sotcliff* the ceremonie of hallovving and bleſſeing belles ſoundeth & ringeth ridiculouſlie, bicauſe he is ridiculous. And if he thinke that the Catholike Church baptiſeth belles as ſhee doth litle infantes, or that ſhee ſaith to the Bel, *I baptiſe thee in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghoſt*: hee is a *ridiculum caput*, to imagin ſo ridiculouſlie. for vvee knovv that none but reaſonable creatures, and thoſe of humain kind, are capable of the Sacrament *of Baptiſm*. And therfore if he looke into the *Pontifical*, or the *Manuel*, he ſhal finde that this bleſsīg of belles, cōſiſteth only in ſprick- aboue.

cling holy vvater, prayers, and other ceremonies, by vvhich the Bel is dedicated to Gods seruice. and although the people in some places (as in Fraunce) cal it baptising of belles, yet this baptising is only a Benediction and dedication of the Bell. And if benediction of vnreasonable creatures displease *Sotcliffes* Spirit, hee must vnderstand that al creatures *may bee sanctified by the vvord of God and prayer*, that is by benediction and inuocation of Gods holy name vpon them.

1. Tim. 4.

The Church therfore, knowing that though *al creatures bee good*, yet some are more sanctified then others, by dedication of them vnto Gods seruice (as the sabboth daye, the Temple and Altars, and priests vvere in the old lavv) and being not ignoraunte, hovv the deuil serueth him selfe of al creatures to molest vs, Shee dedicateth places, vessels, & Belles to Gods seruice, yea blesseth *bread & vvater* called holy bread and holy vvater, that the deuil haue no povver in them, nor on vs that vse them, *as S. Gregorie* saith he had ouer a vvoman, who eating lettice not blessed, receued the deuil vvith it. And if the prayers of euerie iust man be auaileable, why not much more the prayers of the Church? And if *Salomon* prayed that God vvould

Gen. 1.
1. Tim 4.
ib. 1. Dialog. c. 4.
3. Reg. 8.

heare them that should pray in his Temple, & vvas heard also: why may not the Church pray, that vvho soeuer enter into a Church dedicated and consecrated by her, may be heard? And vvhy should she not be heard also? So vvee count it more profitable to pray in a Church then in another place, because in the Church vvee neuer pray alone but haue the Church of Christe to pray with vs & for vs. And if the Church may do this, vvhy may shee not by prayers dedicate certain thinges to holy vse, as holy water, & holy bread, vvhich she hath done of longe tyme. And she praying that vvho soeuer vse thē, may be garāted from diseases & molestatiōs of Satā: why should she not be heard? And vvhy shal not the vse of those thinges, not by any vertue of their ovvn, but by vertue of the Churches praiers, be auaileable? Thus the Church dedicateth belles to goddes seruice, and in the dedication of them prayeth that they may excite the people to deuotion, and terrifie the deuilles that raise tempestes, not by their natural sound, but by vertue of the Churches prayers. And if *Dauids* Harpe 1. Reg. 16. could terrifie the deuil, vvhy not the sound of belles dedicated to that end by the Churches prayers. If the

Holy vvater mentioned by Clem. lib. 8. const. c. 15. Basil. l. de Spiritu Sancto c. 27. Cyp. ep. 70. Cril. Catech 3. Ambr. l. 2. de Sacr. ca. 5. Aug. l. 6. cont. Iul. cap. 5. Theod. l. 5. cap 21. Bed. l. 1. ca. 30. Holy bread by Innoc. ep. 1. c. 5. Aug. ep. 31. 34. 35 36. Autor operis Imperf. ho. 4 in Math. Hieron. in vita Hilarion.

sound of the Priests trompettes, cast dovvn, the walles of *Hierico*. Iosue 6. vvhy may not the sound of these belles in vertue of the Churches prayers ruinate the forces of infernal troupes? Certes this vse is so ancient, that wee find blessing of belles in the booke of the *Romain Order*, vvhose Autour must needes be as old as 800. yeares cā make him: and of belles, and ringing them to Masse & diuine seruice, *Ephrem* maketh mention aboue 12. hundred yeares since, Gregorius Turonensis a 100. yeares since, *S. Bede* 900. yeares since, *Alcuinus* and *Amalarius* almost 800. yeares agone, and *S. Bernard*, 400. yeares past. Vvherfore seing that *Sotcliff* hath not answered this chapter, but only hath made obiections vvhich are answered, I cōclude, as I had done in my Suruey, that *Luther* and *Caluin* and their followers, haue in effect taken away the Sacramentes of *Baptism* and the *Eucharist*, vvhich they professe to hold: and so hauing no sacramentes, can haue no Religion.

Ordo Roman. Ephrem parenes. 13. Greg. Tur. de vita Patrum. cap. 4. Bed. lib. 4. Hist. Angl. cap. 23. Alc. lib. de diuinis offic. c. 17. 19. Amal. lib. 3. de Eccl. offi. c. 1. Bera. ser. 3. quomodo malis duplex &c.

## The Somme of the Sixte chapter.

*IN this chapter after a long commendation of prayer, and a demonstration of the practise thereof in the primatiue and Catholique Church: by di-*

uers pointes of the reformed doctrine, it is proued, that as ther is no great vse of prayer in the new Church of ours Reformers, so according to their doctrine, ther can be noe prayer at all, yea, not any part or petition of our lordes prayer, can be sayed, as is proued particulerly of euerie one of the 7. petitiõs. For if I be sure, by faith, which goeth before prayer, as they say I ame, that I ame elect and that heauen is myne, or, as Zuinglius sayth that Christe can as soon loose it as I: if I be sure that I ame iust and that my sinnes are forgiuen, I cã not from hart pray that ether Gods kingdom come, or that he would forgiue mee my Treſpasses: If I haue no free will, or ame sure I can not keepe his will in the cõmaundements, how can I pray that his will bee done in me and by mee. If al my actions be damnable sinnes as they say, I can noe more pray that Goddes name may be sanctified in mee, then the theefe may pray that Gods name may be sanctified in his thefces and murders: If I bee sure of perseuerance (as Caluin sayth that faith assureth vs not only of preſent but also of futur iustice, yea that the iustifying faith can not be lost) how can I pray not to be ledde into tentation, or not to fal therby? or if (as they say also) all our actions bee sinnes and so falles, how can I pray not to fall that ame sure euerie moment and minut to fall? and if al come by neceſsitie (as certes if Gods præscience and prædestination causeth Rom. 10. Zuingli. lup. fol.

*a neceſsitie in our actions, it doth alſo in all other thinges) howw can I pray vvith hart for rayne, fayre vveather, health, or to bee deliuered from ſicknes, or other euilles and diſaſtres, ſeing that al happeneth by neceſsitie, and ſhal happen or not happen by force of Gods decree and præſcience, vvhether vvee pray or noe. Theſe arguments, and the doctrin of our Aduerſaries in vvhich they are grounded are more at large ſet dovvn: and then the concluſion vvhich follovveth neceſſarilie, is this: that our Reformers can haue no prayer at al in their Church according to their doctrine, no not a ſermon, they denying free vvil: and ſeing that prayer and Religion euer vvent together, neither can ther bee any true Religion amongeſt them.*

*Sotcliffes anſvver vvith the Refutation.*

1. HE anſvvereth to none of theſe arguments in particuler. vvhat then doth hee? firſt, he denyeth the concluſion, ſaying that *common experience and the publique orders of the Church in England*, do witneſſe that they vſe prayer. But he ſhould haue remembred, that I vvent not about to proue that they haue no prayer, but only that they haue ſmal practiſe of prayer in reſpect of the prayer of the Catholique Church, in which moe howvers of the day and night amon-

geſt vs are ſpent in prayer, then dayes amongeſt them: yea, that according to their doctrin they can haue no prayer: and to this he anſvvereth not: vvheras if he could haue anſvvered at al, he ſhould haue runne ouer as I did, euery petition of our lordes prayer, and ſhould haue ſhevved hovv notvvithſtanding this, & this point of doctrine, they may make al the petitions of our lordes prayer. But bicauſe he ſavv that vvas impoſſible, he very vviſelie omitted that labour. Vvhat then hath he done? he only ſcambleth here and there at ſome tvvoe or three of the groundes, out of which I proued that they can haue no prayer.

2. For vvheras I had ſayd, that they hold, that prayer meriteth not any thing and ſatiſfieth for nothing, and thēce inferred that to kneele in prayer, did more hurt to our ſtockings, then good to our ſelues, and that to pill ſtrawes was as profitable to vs, as to pray: he anſvvereth, that though, our prayers do nether merit nor ſatisfie, *yet they obtein thinges neceſſarie, and remoue thinges hurtfull.* but if prayer merit nothing, hovv doth it impetrate any thing more then pilling of ſtrawes, eſpeciallie, ſeing that to impetrate any thing at gods handes, implyeth at leaſt *meritum de*

congruo, which you deny? He goeth on: & *though* (saith he) *payers satisfie not, yet by them we obtein remission of sinnes, for which our Saiour hath sufficiently satisfied.* And how can you obteine this also by prayers, if prayen nether merit nor satisfie, seing that to obtein and impetrate implieth *meritum de congruo*, as I sayd: and seing that you are sure by faith (which as S. *Paul sayth*, goeth before prayer, *for how shal we cal on him in whom we be-*
Rom. 10. *leeue not*) that your sinnes are alreadie remitted, how can you obtein remission of sinnes by prayer, hauing before obteined it by faith, which goeth before prayer?

3. Another ground, by which I sayed they exiled that petitiō, *Thy will bee done in earth as it is in heauen*, & that other also, *and let vs not be led into tētatiō*, was denial of free wil (bicause if we haue no freewill, how can wee pray to fulfill gods will, or that his will may be done in vs, this arguing that wee haue a free will) he answereth I know not what. *Finally* (saith he) *albeit the natural man by freewil and natur doth nether understand the thinges of God nor pursue after thinges pleasing to God: yet directed by gods Holy Spirit, by prayers wee obtein gods grace; that both enlightneth our understanding and helpeth our weakenes.* But this natural

man that speaketh so supernaturallie, telleth vs not vvhether wee haue vvith gods grace free vvill or noe, to concurre to our iustification, to fullfill the cõmaundementes, and to resist tentations of the deuil or flesh. And if he did tel vs so, his good maisters, *Luther* and *Calum*, as vvee haue seen aboue, and shal again herafter, would tel him contrarie. And so he had need to haue something else, to *enlighten his vnderstanding, and to help his vveakenes in answvering.*

4. Another ground vvhich I alleaged out of their doctrin vvas, that they teach that by faith, vvee are assured that our sinnes are forgiuen, that the Kingdom of heauen is for vs, that wee can not fal from gods grace hauing once apprehended Christs iustice by faith: and thence I inferred that vvee can not pray for remission of sinnes, for the Kingdom of heauen, for perseueraunce in grace against the deuil and flesh: being assured of al these thinges by faith before vvee pray: To this he answvereth, thus: *Albeit man is iustified by faith, and that euerie true Christian led by gods Spirit is to assure him selfe of God his fauour: yet are vvee not to neglect the meanes nor to contemne prayers vvhich are exercises of our faith and help to confirme vs, and are meanes to*

obtain thinges necessarie. vvhich is but to deny the conclusion of my argumentes, vvhich haue proued the cõtrarie: an old fault of his, but not to be reprehẽded here, hauing been reprehended once aboue, and once for al. I vvill therfore proue again the cõclusion by the same argument. The argument vvas in effect this: no man can pray before he beleeue, but by beleeuing, his sinnes are forgiuẽ, and he is assured they are forgiuen, and that he is in gods grace and fauour, and can neuer fal from it, that heauen expecteth him and is ordained for him: *ergo* he can pray nether for remission of sinnes, nor perseueraunce in grace, nor for the Kingdom of heauẽ, being cocke sure of al these thinges before he openeth his mouth to praye. The maior propo-

Ro. 10. sition is *S. Paules, hovv can thy cal on him* (by prayer) *in vvhom they beleeue not?* the minor is *Luthers, Caluins*, and *Sotcliffes*, vvho euen in this place *graunteth that only faith iustifieth and assureth vs of Gods fauour*: The cõclusion then must be graunted, till the præmises can be answered.

5. Vvheras for a final conclusion he saith: *The Surueyor therfore that concludeth against the meanes, because wee assure our selues of the end promised vnto vs through Christ Iesus, is but an*

Idiot

Idiot disputer: For albeit wvee hope (yea you say you are sure) to attain to th'end, yet wvee do not deny ordinarie meanes: Vvheras (I say) he inferreth this final conclusion: that only wvas to bewray his final foolerie: because, as that Phisitian vvere an Idiot, who, after that his patrien is cured of his ague and afluted also of the cure, should persvvade him to be let bloud or to take a purgation for the cure: So is *Sorcliff* an Idiot Answverer, that makes prayer a meanes to remission of sinnes, and to obteine perseveraunce and the Kingdom of heauen, these thinges being alreadie obteined or assured vnto vs by faith, before prayer, and consequentlie independentlie of prayer, and onlie dependentlie of faith by vvhich vvee assure our selues, that Christes iustice is ours, novvand for euer, and that consequently vvee can not loose it, nor sayle of obteining heauē, hauing so sure a pledge and vvarrant. *Sorcliff* therfore had need to pray for more vvit to defend prayer and the Lords prayer also, according to his doctrine, or to see the absurditie of his faith and doctrin, that taketh away al prayer: yea and sermons also, vvhich, as I had told them, may bee as vvell addressed by the minister, to a flocke of sheep, as to a Church full of peo-

ple, if they haue no freewill to chaunge their vvilles, and to follow his persuasion.

6. But bicause *Sotcliff* can not answer my former argumentes, I vvill propose him another, by vvhich I vvill proue that according to their doctrin, vvee can pray for no grace, vvhich yet is the principal obiect, at vvhich prayer aimeth. For why shoulaman pray for grace? For remission of his sinnes? they are remitted vvithout al inherent grace, as they say, by faith apprehending Christes iustice, which faith goeth before prayer. For augmentatiō of grace? vvee are iustified (as they say) by Christes iustice, vvhich receueth no increase For perseueraunce in grace? wee are assured by faith neuer to fal from it. To keep the commaundementes? they are impossible. To resist the assaultes of our flesh and Tentations of the deuil? it is also impossible. to auoid sinne? that also is impossible, al our actions euen the best being sinnes. To merit heauen, or to satisfie for sinne? both are as impossible, as to touch heauē vvith our fingar. Vvhy then should vvee pray for grace, vvhich can serue vs to no purpose? If Christe then hath taught vs and cōmaunded to pray, if his Apostles haue taught the same by their examples and preaching,

If prayer be so honourable, so profitable, so laudable, as in this chapter of my Survey I haue shewed: away then with this doctrine, so contrarie to prayer, and let vs leaue Caluin, if wee will not abandon Christe.

KELLISON.

# THE TITLE OF THE FIFTE BOOKE.

*This booke conteineth a Survey of their doctrin concerning God &c.*

## The somme of the first chapter.

THE *old Heretikes* Simon Magus, *Florinus, Blastus, Cerdon, Marcion, and Manicheus, affirm God to be the authour of al euilles, and consequentlie of Sinnes: but with this difference, that* Simon Magus, *onlie sayed God was autour of sinne not immediatelie, but mediatelie and by consequence, in that he gaue man a natur which could not but sinne: Cerdon, Manicheus, and others, auouch onlie the euil God (for they auerred twoe Gods the one good the other euil) to be autour of sinne, and euil. Caluin*

goeth further then Simon Magus, because he saith that God directlie worketh our sinnes and urgeth vs vnto thē: and he blasphemeth in an higher degree then Cerdon, Manicheus, and others: because he chargeth the good God and onlie God with al our sinnes and iniquities, as appeareth by his expresse wordes. The same do Beza and Melanchthon. But that God can not be the Autour of sinne, of which he is the seuere punisher, it is proued by diuers arguments. Then 3. conclusions are out of this blasphemous doctrin, inferred: the first, that such men in Platoes tyme had not been permitted to liue in a cōmon wealth. The second, that these mennes doctrin and Spirit can not be of God, which is so iniurious to God. The third, that litle credit is to be giuen to them in other matters, who doe so grosly erre in this, the cōtrarie being as euident, as that God is Good, or that God and Good go together.

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

HE is returned to his former interrogatories. *But what* (saith he) *if wee teach contrarie? will it not appeare that the Author of Sinne, is as autour also of this shameles, and sinful slaunder.* Better wordes M. Minister, lesse of your boastes & more of your rost. For I hauig already found you false, will neuer trust you vpon *Ye hats*, and *Iffes* again. *The Confession*

(saith he) *of the French Church, and of the Helvetian Church, and English Church, condemne Florinus, and Blastus, and teach that God is not the autour of euil, and that he is cleare of al blame for things done euil.* Vvhat your confessions haue, I dispute not novv, the question is vvhether *Calum, Melanchthon* and *Bezæ*, vvhom I charged, make God the Autour of Sinne or noe? *This Kellison* (saith he) *can not allaege ether sentence or vvord to the contrarie. Calum is much, vvronged by this fovvle mouthed curre. Melanchthon also is most wickedlie slaūdered by this false and vvicked fellow, for he hath noe such vvordes.* He addeth, that I that haue such leisur to prie into al mens faultes, vvould haue set dovvn Bezaes words, if he had sayd any such thing. And vvith these Svvelling, bold and Bigg vvordes, he thinkes to face it out. But I hauing learned by experience euen in *Sotshoff*, that none do more peremptorilie deny the fault, then he that knoweth him selfe guiltie (for so he must do, to put away all suspicion) will not beleeue him on his *whats*, and therfore vvill set dovvn *Calums* vvordes, vvhich before I had alleaged. Put on then your spectacles M. Minister, and put of your vizard vvhich keepes you from blushing, and then let me see vvhether you haue the face to a-

uouch this again. you say, that *Caluin is so farre fō saying, that God is the Authour of al wickednes that expressely l. 1. Inst. c. 18. he teacheth, that God is Authour of no wickednes.* You haue not, I see, put of your vizard, as I desired you, for thē you would neuer haue been so impudēt. *Caluin* in that chapter & diuers other places, affirmeth in deed that God cōmaundeth vs not to sinne, yet he saith, he willeth our sinnes: he auoucheth also that he sinneth not in causing our sinnes, yet he boldlie and very ofte tymes pronounceth, that he is the cause & Autour of them. Yea he saith euē in that place, *that God commaunded Satan to be a lying Spirit.* In the verie first *Section* of that chapter, he saith, *that our carnal sense can not comprehend how it can be, that God working by the Reprobate, is not soiled by their vices, and how in a worke common to them both, God is without fault.* for this cause he saith Catholiques deuised the distinction of *doing and permitting. Ils ingent* (saith he) *que c'est vne chose desraisonnable.* &c. *They think it a thing vnreasonable that a man by the will and decree of God should be blinded, and yet to be punished afterwards for his blindnes: wherefore they take this vnhappy escape, that this is not done by Gods will, but by his permission.* And then refuting this distinction,

l. 1. Inst. c. 18. sect. 1. Imp. Gal. 1562.

he saith, that God not only permitted the deuil but also willed him to proue *Iob* by afflictions: and therfore saith, *nous auons a conclure que Dieu a esté l'autheur de ceste espreuue, &c. vvee haue to conclude that God vvas th'authour of this proofe, of vvhich Satan and the theeues vvere the ministers.* So that *Caluin* makes the deuil and the *Sabeans* and *Chaldeans*, vvho so iniustlie killed Iobs childrē, and despoiled him of his riches, only the instruments and ministers of these murders and Robberies, and God the *principal Authour*. The same hee sayth in his *Latin Institutions*, printed at *Geneua* by *Ihon le Preux*, in the yeare of our Lord 1592. And so *Sotcliff* is th'Authour of a lye, in denying that *Caluin* sayth God is the Authour of al vvickednes; and he bevvrayeth more then ordinarie impudencie, vvhen he sayth, that *Caluin, l. 1. Inst. c. 18. teacheth that God is autour of no wickednes*: who yet in the place alleaged sayd God not only permitteth but vvilleth sinnes, & is the authour of them, and repeateth this an 100. tymes in the sayd chapter and endeuoureth to proue it out of Scriptur. There *Caluin* sayth, *Ergo quicquid agitent homines, vel Satan ipse, Deus tamen clauum tenet, vt ad exequendā suū iudicia conuertat eorum cōatus.* There he sait: *Si Dei iudicium est exca-* Sect. 1. ibidem.

rio & vniuersa Achab, nudæ permissionis figmentum esse sortis quasi ridiculum esset, sed eum tantum permittere non etiam decernere quid fieri velit & mandare executionem ministris. There he saith, quicquid simultiæ exercent Chaldæi in Iudæa, opus Dei esse pronunciat Ieremias. vvhat soeuer cruelties the Chaldees exercise in Iudea, Ieremie pronounceth to be the vvorke of God: ergo God vvas autour of their crueltie, vvhich vvas sinne. There

§. 2. he sayth: Et certè nisi intus operaretur in mentibus hominum, &c. And trulie if God did not inwardlie vvork in the myndes of men (to vvit sinne) it should not haue been trulie sayd, that God doth take avvay the lippe from the true in vvordes, prudence from the ancientes, the hart from the Princes, that they may erre in by-vvayes. And

§ 3. again, Et iam satis aperte ostendi Deum vocari eorum omnium auctorem, quæ isti censores volunt otioso tantum eius permissu contingere: And I haue alreadie sufficiently shevved that God is the autour of althose thinges (sinnes) vvhich these censors (Catholike Doctours) vvill haue to happen only by Gods permission. But let me come to the places by mee alleaged. I alleaged out of Caluin these vvordes in Inglish: God not only forseeth mans sinnes, but also hath created him of determinate purpose to that end. This Caluin hath in the same place, & diuers other pla-

1. 1 Inst. c. 23 §. 6.

ces. For in that place, he sayth, some may obiect: *at God might haue hindred the sinnes vvch he forseeth, if he had would; and seing he hath not, did of determinate purpose create man to that end, that he should so be haue him selfe in earth.* And then though he vvould seeme to go about to answer this obiection, yet in deed he graunteth it, saying, *consilio nutuque suo ita ordinat, vt inter homines nascantur ab vtero certæ morti deuoti, qui suo exitio ipsius nomen glorificent: by his counsel, and vvill or appointment, he so ordaineth, that amongest men some should be born destined to certain death, euen from the vvomb, to glorifie the name of God by their perdition.* and in the 7. Section he repeateth often, that Adam fell and al posteritie in him, by Gods decree and *admirable* consel, and so vvere created of purpose to sinne. *Decretum quidem horribile fateor: inficiari tamen nemo poterit quin præsciuerit Deus quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet, et ideo præsciuerit, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat. It is an horrible decree I graunt* (sayth Calvin) *but no man can deny, but that God did forsee before he created man vvhat end man, vvas to haue, and therfore did forsee because by his decree he had so ordained.* And in that chapter he seeketh to proue that man sinneth not only, God forseing, but also or-

daining and decreeing. I added that *Calvin* sayd, *God not only permitteth sinne but willeth it*: that he sayd also, *It is not likely that man by him selfe by the only permission of God, without any ordinaunce, brought destruction to him selfe.* And let *Sotcliff* read the alleaged chapter and
§. 2. there he shal finde those wordes: *Hic ad distinctionem voluntatis et permissionis recurritur, secundum quam obtinere volunt, permittente modo, non autem volente Deo, perire impios. Sed cur permittere dicimus, nisi quia ita vult? quanquam nec ipsum quidem per se probabile est, sola Dei permissione, nulla ordinatione, hominem sibi accersisse, interitum.* Which if *Sotcliff* conster, he shall finde this to be the latin of that Inglish. I alleaged that *Calvin* should also affirm these wordes: *When Absalon abused his Fathers wiues, it was gods will, so to punish Dauids aduouterie, and God commaunded him to do it to that end.* And read you, Sir Minister, the 18. chapter of the first booke, and tel mee whether that you finde, not the latin of this Inglish.
§. 4. *Nam etsi dum stuprauit Absalō Patris vxores, voluit Deus hoc probro vlcisci Dauidis adulterium, non ideo tamen præcepit scelerato filio incestum admittere, nisi forte Dauidis respectu.* Wher we see, that he hath the wordes by mee alleaged for although in that place, he say *that though*

*it vvas gods vvil so to punish dauids aduoutrie yet he commaunded not Absalon to commit incest:* yet by that exceptiō, he meaneth only, that God did not absolutlie commaund him, but yet graunteth that he might cōmaund him to this end, to punish, by that sinne of Absalon, his fathers aduoutrie, vvhich is gathered by these vvordes, *nisi forte Dauidis respectu.* And aboue he saith, that *Semei* his reuilings, *Dauid confesseth to haue proceeded from Gods commaundement.* Yet I graunt also that *Caluin* diuers tymes saith that God vvilleth but commaundeth not sinne: and bicause this seemed hard, he counselleth, *that if vvee vnderstand not, hovv God vvill haue that done which he forbiddeth to be done, that vvee remember our ovvn imbecillitie, and thinke vvith our selues, that the light in vvhich God dvvelleth, is not in vayn called, inaccessible.* The same *Caluin* saith: *Absalon by incestuous copulation, defiling his Fathers bed, did commit a detestable sinne, yet God pronounceth this to be his own worke.* I had charged also *Caluin* vvith these vvordes, *God blindeth and hardeneth the Reprobate, not only by not illuminating them, nor mollifying them by grace, but bicause he stirreth vp their willes, & not only suffreth sinners, but also boweth and turneth their Hartes.* And dare you Sir Deane, deny *Caluin*

§. 1.

l. 1. Inst. c. 18. §. 1.

to haue sayd so? read his alleaged Latin Institutiõs, and you shal finde the Latin of al that English, *Sæpissime excecare Deus dicitur & indurare reprobos, eorum corda vertere, inclinare, impellere vt alibi fusius docui. Moste often is God sayd to blinde and harden the reprobate, to turne, incline, and to driue forvvard their hartes.* So I English the vvord, *impellere*, vvhich *Thomas Phómasius* Englisheth also to egge forvvard, to thrust violentlie, to inforce, to moue, to stirre &c. and then he addeth that God doth this not only by vvithdravving his grace, illumination and direction, but also bicause he deliuered them vp to Satan, *and by him ordaineth their Counsels whether it pleaseth him, and stirres vp their vvilles, and confirmeth their indeuors, yea, saith he, bicause God vvould haue Sehon perish, the obstinacie of his hart, vvas gods preparation to his ruine.*

Lib. Inst. cap. 4. §. 3. 4.

v. impello et impellor.

I related also out of Caluin those vvordes: *I graunt that theeues and murderers, and other euil doers, are th'instrumentes of gods prouidence, vvhom the lord doth vse to execute, those iudgements, which he hath him selfe determined.* Other vvordes I added, in vvhich *Caluin* saith, that y^e deuil and vvicked men are the instrumẽts of God sent by him &c. And behold the same in *Caluins* latin *institutions* of the alleaged

Edition. *Ego plus cõcedo: fures et homicidas, et similes maleficos diuinæ esse prouidentiæ instrumenta, cuius dominus ipse ad exequenda quæ apud se iusta constituit, vtitur.* And in his second booke and fourth chapter he thus pronounceth, *Sed præcipue tum declarauit quam non sit otiosus ille (reprobis) dum Sennacharib secuum vocat, ac ad secandum manu sua et destinata fuit et impulit*, And in the next section: *Spiritus ergo impurus, Dei spiritus vocatur, quia ad eius nutum prætiamque respondet, instrumentum magis ipsius in agendo, quam a seipso author.* And so *Sutcliff* seeth al in latin, vvherwith I had charged Caluin in Inglish: and consequentlie, must confesse his brazen impudencio, vvhen he sayed: *Caluin is much wronged by this foule mouthed curre: for he is so farre from teaching that God is the Author of al vvickednes, that expresselie l. 1. Iust. c. 18. he teacheth that God is Author of no vvickednes.* Is not he Author of sinne, vvho vvilleth and vvorketh sinne, vrgeth vs and eggeth vs to sinne, decrees our sinnes, and who is a more principal cause of sinne then Satan, he being but his instrument? lib. 1. cap. 17. § 6. lib. 2 cap. 4. § 4. § 5.

2. Let vs now come to *Melachthon*, whom *Sut.* saith *I have most vvickedlie slandered*: his vvordes shal be my discharge: *Nos damnus*

Mel. in c. 8. Rom. edit. 1. (sayth he) *non solum permittere Deum creaturis vt operentur, sed ipsum proprie omnia agere: vt sicut fatentur proprium dei opus fuisse Pauli vocationem, ita fateantur opera Dei propria esse, siue quæ media vocantur, vt comedere, bibere, communia cum brutis, siue quæ mala sunt, vt Dauids adulterium, Manlij seueritatem animaduertentis in filiũ. Iam cum constet Deum omnia facere non permissiue, sed potenter: hoc est, vt sit eius proprium opus Iudæ proditio, sicut Pauli vocatio &c. ergo non est cur frigidum illud glossema recipiamus, Deum mala permittere non etiam facere;* vvhich in Inglish: soundeth thus: *Vvee say that God not only permitteth Creatvrs to vvorke, but doth properlie vvorke al: that, as they graunt Paules vocation to be the proper vvorke of God, so they may confesse both indifferent vvorkes, as to eate and drinke, vvhich are common to vs vvith brute beastes, and euil vvorkes, as Dauids aduouterie, and Manlius seueritie against his sonne, to bee the proper vvorkes of God. Novv vvhen it is manifest, that God doth al not permissiuelie but potentelie, that is so, that Judas treason and betraying, is Gods proper vvorke, as vvel as Paules vocation &c. therfore ther is no cause vvhy vvee should receue that cold glosse, that God doth permitt euilles, but not do them.*

3. Let vs see now vvhether Beza speaketh better, and vvhether I therfore named him

but cited not his vvordes, bicause (as *Sotcliff* saith) they made not for my purpose Speake then *Beza*, and proue thy Schollet *Sotcliff*, a lyar. *Nos Adamum dicimus sponte et sua culpa lapsum, non tamen fortuito, sed prout definitum dei cōsilium, providentia, & manus determinarant vt fieret.* which in Inglish importeth as much as this: *vvee say Adam did fal of his ovvn accord, and by his o'vvn fault, but yet not by chaunce, but as the certain counsel, prouidence and povver of God had determined.* Put of your vizard, Sir Minister, and looke mee in the face, that I may see vvhether you haue the face, that cā hold it selfe from blushing against this so plaine a proofe? do you still stand to it, that I haue iniuried *Calum*, calumniated *Melanchthon*, and wronged Beza, in charging them to make God th' Autour and worker of sinne? O impudencie, not to bee struien vvithal by any modest man, but to be shunned as mōstrous and vglye. But yet is not *Sotcliff*, more brazen faced then *whitaker* vvho once had the audacitie to vtter these most impudent vvordes: *Si Caluinus, aut Martyr, aut Philippus, aut quispiam nostrum affirmet deum esse authorem et causam peccati, non repugno quin omnes simus horrendæ blasphemiæ, scelerisque rei:* If *Caluin*, or *Peter Martyr*, or *Philip Melanchthon*,

Beza lib. de arcana Dei præd. cont. Castal. fol. 334.

Vvhitaker Resp. ad 3. Rarion. Cāpiani.

or any of ours affirme that God is the author and cause of sinne, I deny not but that wee are guiltie of horrible blasphemie and wickednesse. But they do affirm soe, *ergo* you are guiltie of *Horrible blasphemie*. The *maior* is *Whitakers*: The *minor* is *Caluins Melanchthons*, and *Bezaes*, yea Peter Martyrs also: the conclusion is mine, which can not be denyed, the *maior* being graunted, and the *minor* proued.

Pet. Mart in ep. R. 8. fol. 38.

4. Now wheras *Caluin* saith that not withstanding that God willeth and worketh all our sinnes, yet he sinneth not, because he worketh that for a good end which Satan and the wicked do for an euil purpose: that I had refuted, because *bonum est ex integra causa, malum ex quocunque defectu*, and so a good end or intention will not suffice, when the meanes and electiō are euil: else it were lawfull *to do euil, that there may come good*, and so to steale, to help the poore. Yea if God be the Autour of sinne, he is also the autour of the sinners euil intention, and so worketh sinne for the same euil end that the sinner doth. Wheras *Sotcliffe* addeth that *Caluin only saith that God doth not only permit men to do, but doth gouern their actions and direct them to such good ends as he appointeth*. If he meane that God, though he worke not the sinne, yet after it

Dionisius Areopag.

Rom. 3.

is done, vseth it to shew his iustice, as he did in *Iudas*, *Ananias* & *Saphiras* death, or his mercie, as he did in *S. Peters*, *S. Paules*, *S. Matthewes* & *S. Marie Magdalens* repentaunce, he had spoken in deed no otherwise then S. *Austin* & al Catholike deuines doe: but if he meane that God vvorketh and directeth, and preordaineth our euil actions to shevv his iustice, in sinners: it is but to say (as aboue *Calum* doth) that God vvorketh the same euil action vvhich the deuil and the sinner do, but they for an euil, God for a good end: and seing that a good end vvill not suffice vvhen the meanes are euil (as I haue told him,) this excuseth not God from sinne.

5. But *Sotel.* answereth also, that *Calum* only meaneth that God is the authour of the realitie and substaunce, but not of the mallice or the obliquitie of the action. So in deed *Vvhitaker* seeketh to excuse these so many of *Calums* blasphemies: as though *Calum* sayd no more then S. *Thomas*, and al diuines do, to vvit, that God is the Authour of the real Acte in sinne, as he is of al entitie, and cōcurreth also to the substaunce of the act, else the vvill being a second cause, which is essentially depending of the first cause, could not operate or vvorke at al. But for this concur-

Respons. ad 8. Rationem Cāpiani.

rence to the substaunce of the act, he should not haue sayed absolutelie that God, is the Authour of Sinne: and therfore S. *Thomas*, vvho in the *Second Article of his 79. question of his second parte*, affirmeth God to be the cause of the realitie of the Act of sinne, denyeth in the first article, that God is the Authour of sinne. And good reason; bicause God is a cause efficient and not deficient, as our vvill is: and therfore vvhat is real and good in the act of sinne, is to be ascribed not only to our vvil, but also to God: but that the lame action is deficient, svverving from reason's rule, and Gods lavv, it is to bee ascribed only to the will. So, saith *S. Thomas*, when one halteth in his vvalking, his vvalking and motion is to be attributed to the faculte of vvalking, called, *potentia motiua*, or *progressiua*, yea to God *that concurreth*: but the halting and defect in vvalking, is to be ascribed to the lame legge, in vvhich only is the defect, not *to potentia motiua*, much lesse to God. So vvhen an expert Scriuener vvriteth vvith an euil penne: vvhat is real and positiue in that vvriting, is to be attributed to the Scriuener, but the defectuositie and defect, redoundeth only to the penne, there only being the defect. And so though God

1. 2. q. 79. a. 1. 2.

bee cause with the vvill, of the substaunce & realitie of the acte of sinne, yet the mallice and obliquitie of the action, is only of the halting vvill.

5. Vvherfore, though vvee may say, that God is cause vvith our vvill of the real acte of sinne, yet Christian tongues haue euer feared to say absolutelie (as Caluin doth) that God is the cause, or autour, or worker of sinne, or mouer, or ordainer, or fulligator vnto it: and Christian eares haue euer burned to heare such blasphemies against the diuine Goodnes, and Scriptures doe exclame, and ancient fathers cry out of them. *God commaunded no man to sinne. God is not a Tempter of euil. Do not say, God deceiued mee. Thou o God art not a louer of iniquitie.* saith scriptur. And where Scripture seemeth to say that God is cause of sinne, or commaunds sinne, it is not to be expounded properlie, *quando sonat flagitium*, but improperlie, and permissiuelie, bicause God permitteth sinne. the fathers also in a thousand places do cleare God from sinning and being any cause of sinne: as S. *Dionisius Areopagita*, S. *Iustinus*, S. *Irenæus*, S. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Eusebius*, S. *Athanasius*, S. *Basil*, S. *Gregorie Nazianzen*, and of *Nisse*, S. *Chrisostome*, S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Austin* and

Eccl. 15. Iac. 1. Eccl. 15. Psal. 5.

Bel to.3.l. 3.de amiss. grat.c.9.

others, vvhom *Bellarmine* alleageth. Reason also in this matter pleadeth for the authour of reason, as I haue shewed in my Survey. And so vvee may see a difference betvvixt ancient fathers and *Caluin*, they neuer saying that God vvilleth, vvorketh, causeth sinne, moueth and eggeth and ordaineth vs to sinne, as *Caluin* doth. Vvhereas *Caluin* sayth that though God be absolutelie called the autour of sinne, yet he is not to be thought to sinne, I can not see hovv that can be, because to say absolutlie that he is the autour of sinne, is to say that he is autour euen of the malice of sinne, that being the thing vvhich formallie maketh the acte a sinne. For as to say absolutelie, that the painter drevv this pictur, or that the Caruer made this statua, is not to say that hee made the cloth or stone, but rather that hee wrought the formal representatiō and figure, vvhich maketh the cloth a picture, and the stone a statua: so to say absolutelie (as Caluin doth) that God is the vvorker, authour, and cause, yea principal cause of sinne, is to say, that God is the cause, euen of the malice, vvhich maketh the acte a sinne: else he could no more be called the autour of sinne, thē the weauer can be called the autour of the pictur, bi-

cause he made the cloth, vvheron the painter hath drawn the picture.

7. Now therefore vvhereas *Sorel* like a woman that counteth her chickins before they be hatche, concludeth in this manner: *vvherefore seing this Kellison setteth down in his own malicious slaunders, and not our vvordes, he may if he finde any absurditie redounding therof, take the same vvholly to himselfe and not impute it to vs.* I may vvith good right borrow the same vvordes of *Sorel*, to inferre this conclusion against him: vvherfore seing *Kellison*, setteth not down his own vvordes, but *Calvins, Melanchons*, and *Bezes* blasphemies, & might haue added the like speeches of *Luther, Zuinglius*, & *Peter Martyr*: the absurditie that redoundeth therof, is to bee fathered not on *Kellison* but on them: and their Religion, can not bee of God being so iniurious to the Goodnes of God, vvho could not be God if he vvere not Good, and can not be Good, if he be the source of sinne, vvhich is the greatest euill. The conclusion.

Luc. ar. 36. impr. Vvitemb. an. 1520. & l. de ser arb. Zuing. ser. de provid. ad Canonicos Petr. Mart. in ep. Rom. fol. 38.

## The Somme of the second chapter.

THis Chapter taketh as graunted and proued in the former, that God vvorketh and wil-

leth all our sinnes, and consequently he sinneth: and it addeth how Calvin teacheth that God so forcibly moueth both the deuil and sinners, that of necessitie they yeeld, and so by necessitie are excused. Wherefore is inferred, that according to Calvin, God is the only sinner, man & the deuil no sinners, because excused by necessitie.

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

SOtcliff, as his manner is, boldlie denyeth that euer Calvin sayd, that Gods will so domineereth ouer the deuilles and mannes will, as to presse them with necessitie, and he auoucheth my accusations to *be matters vtterlie false, and that there is no such matter to be found in the places of Calvin*, by mee alleaged. But (to vse your interrogatorie) what if there bee? Is not then God a sinner and the only sinner, man and the deuil innocentes, Sotcl: bold and impudēt? I alleaged *Calvins* wordes l. 3. Inst. cap. 23. § 8. where he thus pronounceth: *Non dubitabo igitur, &c. I will not doubt therfore, to cōfesse simplie with Austin that the will of God is a necessitie of thinges.* By wh^ch thinges, though *S. Austin* meane only creatures, whose first creatiō was not in their power: because it was not in their power to bee or not bee, but only in the power of God that gaue them their being: yet *Calvin* meaneth our

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 23. § 8.

Aug. l. 4. de gen. ad lit. c. 15.

actions, euen our sinnes. and therfore in the next section he sayth: *excusabiles habere volunt reprobi, quod euadere nequeant peccandi necessitatē, præsertim cùm ex Dei ordinatione sibi injiciatur huiusmodi necessitas: nos verò inde neq; minùs ritè excusari: the reprobate will be deemed excusable because they cā not auoid ye necessitie of sinning, seing this necessitie is imposed on them by gods ordination.* Sect. 9.

The same necessitie he auoucheth *l. 2. Inst. c. 3. §. 5.* Bex in abstersione calumniarum Hesshusij ad 1. calumiam. I de prouidence. *Bez* Caluins successor, subscribeth saying: *Iudas si Dei decretū consideremus, eo ipso momento necessario dominū prodidit, &c. Iudas, if we consider Gods decree, did necessarilie betray our Lord euen in that moment; Herod also and Pilat, did necessarilie condēne Christe, &c.* So that men, according to these doctours, do sinne of necessitie. As touching the deuil, *Caluin* hath these vvordes: *Constat ergo sub Dei potestate esse Satanam, & sic ipsius nutu regitur vt obsequium reddere ei cogatur. It is manifest therfore that Satan is vnder the povver of God, and is so gouerned by his vvil or appointment, that he is compelled to obey him.* And a litle after: *sed quis Deum illum potentiæ suæ freno vinctum constrictumque tenet, ea modo exequitur, &c. But bicause God holdeth him (the deuil) bound and tyed vvith the bridle of his povver, he doth novv exequute those thinges vvhich are graunted to him from God: &* l. 1. Inst c. 14. §. 17. Ibidem.

*so he obeyeth his Creatour, vvil he nil he: because he is compelled to yeeld his seruice and ministrie, whether soeuer God driueth him impulerit.* Hence as I deduced this argument, so do I again. God is th'authour, yea principal autour, vvorker, and vviller, of sinne, yea ordainer, instigatour, yea commaunder, as *Caluin* and others teach aboue in the former chapter. But sinne can be imputed to none more iustlie, than to the principal autour, mouer, ordainer, and commaunder, *ergo* God sinneth. Nether can he plead necessitie for an excuse (hee only hauing freevvil as *Luther* sayth, and being subiect to no necessitie) nether will his good end excuse him, as aboue I haue proued. And seing man and the deuil haue no free vvill, but are constrained euen by God to sinne (as *Caluin*, and *Beza* and al of them vse to teach) they are to bee excused, because there is no better excuse then necessitie, and none are to be blamed for that vvhich they could not auoyd, sinne being no sinne as S. *Austin* affirmeth vnlesse it bee free and voluntarie. And so according to our Reformers or rather deformers, God is th'only sinner, man and the deuil are innocentes: & accordig to this doctrin, *Luther, Caluin, Zuinglius, Melanethon, Peter Martyr, Beza*, are blas-

Luth. l. de seruo arb.

Aug. l. de ver. Relig. c. 14.

phemers, and Sotcliff a lovvd lyar, vvho so boldly denyeth, that euer they thus blasphemed.

## The somme of the third chapter.

Luther, Calvin, and their followers, affirme the cõmaundementes to be impossible: vvhich their assertion is proued by Scripture and reason to be false. Then out of it is inferred this conclusion, to wit, that God is an vnreasonable Prince to commaund his subiectes thinges impossible: vvhich cõclusion is also illustrated by examples.

Luth. l. de seruo arb. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 7. §. 5. & in harmon. Mat. 19.

*Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

1. Sotcliff might vvith more honour confesse, that he is not able to answere these argumentes, then to trifle as he doth. He braggeth first, as he is vvont to doe, that *to say that they teach soe, is so grosse a lye that a man may almost touch it vvith his finger.* Then, not daring to stand to this, he sayth, *suppose vvee should say that the lavv cannot perfectlie be performed, yet should vvee say no more then Ambrose, Chrysostome, and Bernard, and Thomas Aquinas.* But vvhether Sot. Maisters teach the lavv to be impossible, or noe,

let their vvordes Iudge. *Luthers* opinion in this matter is playnlie set down in his booke *de seruo arbitrio*, as I had aduertised Sotcliff. I had alleaged also *Caluins* vvordes, vvhich are these, *quod semel impossibilem reu legis obiectionem diximus, id est paucis verbis explicandum simul & confirmandum, &c.* But that vve say the lavv is impossible, that is in fevv vvordes to be explicated and also to be cõfirmed: for it is vvant to seem a most absurd opinion to the common people. And then explicating hovv he sayd the lavv is impossible, he sayth, *Impossibile appello quod nec vnquam fuit, & ne imposterum sit, Dei ordinatione ac decreto impeditur: I call that impossible vvhich nether at any tyme vvas, and is hindred by Gods ordination and decree, that it neuer be hereafter.* And in al that chapter he endeuoureth to shevv, that the lavv vvas not giuen vs, as though vvee could fulfil it, but to shevve vs our ovvn impotencie and miserie, and to restrain vs from external actions of sinne though it can not from internal desires, and to make vs runne to Christes iustice, hauing none in our selues. and aboue I haue alleaged other places in vvhich they teach the same. Sotcl: answereth that though *vvee can not absolutelie fulfill the lavv yet vvee may in parte.* But then I demaund vvhat he

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 7. § 5.

§. 10.

meaneth vvhen he sayth, in parte? ether he meaneth that vvee can obserue some lavves but not al (as in deed he sayth vve may by grace perform many) & then he must graunt God to be vnreasonable, at least in those some, that are impossible. Or he meaneth that vvee can fulfill al lavves imperfectly but not perfectly: and then I demaund vvhether that perfection vvhich exceedeth our force be commaunded? If he say it is not commaunded, then it followeth that vvee may fulfill the lavv perfectlie, bicause it is a lavv no further then it commaundeth: and so, if so farre it may be fulfilled, then may it be fulfilled not only in parte, but also perfectlie. If he say that ouerplus of perfection vvhich is beyond our povver and reach, is cõmaunded, (as *Caluin* sayth, *the lavv exacting perfect*[1] *lyue of God, condemneth al imperfection*) then God at least in commaunding that ouerplus is a Prince vnreasonable. Vvere it not then better to say vvith Catholiques that vvee can not fulfill the lavv by force of nature, as the Pelagians sayed, but yet may by grace, vvhich Christe offereth to euerie one, fulfill euery perticuler cõmaundement so farre as it bindeth? For so nether do vve attribute to much to our ovvn force (vvee acknovv-

[1] Inst. c. 19. §. 4.

ledging our selues vnable vvithout Christes grace) neither do vvee make God vnreasonable, because vvee acknovvledge, that hee commaundeth no more, then vvee are able to fulfill by his grace, if vvee add vvill to his grace.

2. And although some Fathers and diuines may some tymes say, that vvee can not fulfill the lavv, yet their meaning is: either that vvee can not by our selues vvithout Christes grace: or that vvee can not so perfectlie, but that vvee sinne veniallie at one tyme or other: or that vvee can not so fulfill the lavv as to attain to the end of the lavv. As for example, the end of that lavv, *Thou shalt not couet*, is not to haue *any, not so much as indeliberate concupiscence*. but this perfection, as vvee can not haue in this life, so it is not commaunded, but is reserued for a complemet, or perfection in the next life: only in this life, vvee are commaunded, not to consent deliberatelie to our euil concupiscences, vvhich vvith Christes grace, vvee may fulfill: for though no man can auoyd all indeliberate motions of concupiscence, yet euerie ma may deny cõsent vnto them, which only is forbidden. Vvherfore, for any thing that this answerer hath sayd, I may a-

gain conclude vvith this argument. That Prince is vnreasonable vvho commaundeth his subiectes more then he is able to exequute: as to runne or leape, he being not able to goe: or to flye in the ayre, nature having denyed him such agilitie: but the reformers say that God hath commaunded vs to obserue lavves, vvhose obseruation is not in our povver, and vvhich (as Calvin sayth) *by gods decree and ordinaunce*, are exempted from our povver, *ergo* hee is an vnreasonable lavvmaker, King, and Prince.

## The Somme of the fourth chapter.

HE *is a cruel tyrant who not only commaundeth impossible thinges to his subiectes, but afflicteth or killeth them for not fulfilling his commaundements: but God cõmaundeth things impossible, if we beleeve our reformers alleaged in the secõd chapter, and he punisheth vs eternallie for not fulfilling them, if we credit Scripture: ergo he is most cruel and tyranical: and* Dionisius, Nero, *and* Diocletian, *were in comparison of him, verie Clement Princes.* Matth. 23.

### *Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.*

1. THe Minister answvereth: *out of our doctrin no such matter is to be inferred.*

*For as in matter of debtes, the creditor may iustly exact his owne, the debter hauing bound himselfe to pay, and after proouing vnsufficient and vnable: so man is iustly punished for not paying his debt vnberto he is bound, and vvhich by his owne fault he is made vnable to pay.* So that Sotcliffe can see, how God can iustlie punish man for sinning, vvho could not chuse but sinne, yea vvho by Gods vvill and decree is constrained to sinne: vvhich yet he graunteth *Luther* (as I had alleaged) could not see, and vvhich (as vvee haue seen) *Caluin* also could not see: and so he can see farther into a milstone then they, who yet were his Maisters. And so he is either the beast *Lynx*, that is so quick of sight, or the man *Lyncew*, that could see shippes and number them an 130. miles of, yea could see thorovv a vvalle. But then I demaund of him, by vvhose fault vvee fel into this vnablenes, to fulfill the commaundements? If he answer, by Adams fault, who sinning depriued him selfe, and vs in him, of grace: I vvil bring his maister *Caluin* against him: who auerreth that Adam fell by Gods *ordinaunce*, *vvill* and *secret Counsel* and decree vvhich imposeth also necessitie on al our actions, as aboue vvee haue related: and so Adam fel not by his owvn fault, necessitie

Luth. de seruo arb. Calu. l. 1. Inst. c. 18. sect. 3.

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 23. sect. 7. & 8. & sup. c. 2.

excusing him, but by Gods will and decree, and so by his fault, if there were any fault. if he say that euerie one, by his owne fault fel into this weakenes, then either he meaneth by his owne original, or his own actual sinne. If he say by his original sinne, *Calum* 3. Inst. c. will tell him that it can not proceed of vs 3. sect. 7. that wee are al born in sinne and subiect to damnation, *sed admirabili Dei consilio*, but *from the admirable Counsel of God*: and so man fel not by his owne fault into original sinne. If he mean actual sinne, that also according to *Calum* is the worke of Gods will and decree, and is not to bee imputed to vs a fault, wee being excused by a dominet & sing necessitie, as aboue is proued out of *Calum*, and *Bez.* in the second chapter. And so if man be fallen into an vnablenes of fulfilling the commaundements, he fel not by his owne fault but Gods fault (if wee beleeue these new maisters) and so God is most cruel to punish man with Hellish tormentes for not fulfilling the commaundementes, which he is not able to fulfill, and without al fault on his parte, is become thus vnable.

But be it that man by his owne fault fel into this weakenes, yet will not this excuse God from most barbarous cruelnie. Bi-

ledging our selues vnable vvithout Christes grace) nether do vvee make God vnreasonable, bicause vve acknovvledge, that hee commaundeth no more, then vvee are able to fulfill by his grace, if vvee add vvill to his grace.

2. And although some Fathers and diuines may some tymes say, that vvee can not fulfill the lavv, yet their meaning is: ether that vvee can not by our selues vvithout Christes grace: or that vvee can not so perfectlie, but that vvee sinne veniallie at one tyme or other: or that vvee can not so fulfill the lavv as to attain to the end of the lavv. As for example, the end of that lavv, *Thou shalt not couet*, is not to haue *any, not so much as indeliberate concupiscence*. but this perfection, as vvee can not haue in this life, so it is not commaunded, but is reserued for a complemēt, or perfection in the next life: only in this life, vvee are commaunded, not to consent deliberatelie to our euil concupiscences, vvhich vvith Christes grace, vvee may fulfill: for though no man can auoyd all indeliberate motions of concupiscence, yet euerie mā may deny cōsent vnto them, which only is forbidden. Vvherfore, for any thing that this answerer hath sayd, I may a-

gain conclude vvith this argument. That Prince is vnreasonable vvho commaundeth his subiectes more then he is able to exequute: as to runne or leape, he being not able to goe: or to flye in the ayre, nature having denyed him such agilitie: but the reformers say that God hath commaunded vs to obserue lavves, vvhose obseruation is not in our povver, and vvhich (as *Caluin* sayth) *by gods decree and ordinaunce*, are exempted from our povver, *ergo* hee is an vnreasonable lavvmaker, King, and Prince.

## The Somme of the fourth chapter.

HE is a cruel tyrant who not only commaundeth impossible thinges to his subiectes, but also tormenteth or Killeth them for not fulfilling his commaundement: but God commaundeth impossible, if vve beleeue the reformers alleged in the secõd chapter, and he punisheth vs eternallie for not fulfilling them, if vve credit Scripture: *ergo* he is most cruel and tyrannical: and Dionisius, Nero, and Diocletian, vveare in comparison of him, verie Clemens Princes. Math. 25.

## Sotcliffes answver vvith the Refutation.

1. THe Minister answvereth: out of our doctrin no such matter is to be inferred.

*For as in matter of debtes, the creditor may iustlie exact his owne, the debter hauing bound himselfe to pay, and after prouing vnsufficient and vnable: so man is iustly punished for not paying his debt vnberto he is bound, and vvhich by his owne fault he is made vnable to pay.* So that Sotcliff can see, how God can iustlie punish man for sinning, vvho could not chuse but sinne, yea vvho by Gods vvill and decree is constrained to sinne: vvhich yet he graunteth *Luther* (as I had alleaged) could not see, and vvhich (as vvee haue seen) *Caluin* also could not see: and so he can see farther into a milstone then they, who yet were his Maisters. And so he is ether the beast *Lynx*, that is so quick of sight, or the man *Lynceus*, that could see shippes and number them an 130. miles of, yea could see thorow a vvalle. But then I demaund of him, by vvhose fault vvee fel into this vnablenes, to fulfill the commaundements? If he answer, by Adams fault, who sinning depriued him selfe, and vs in him, of grace: I vvil bring his maister *Caluin* against him: who auerreth that Adam fell by Gods *ordinance*, *vvill* and *secret Counsel* and decree vvhich imposeth also necessitie on al our actions, as aboue vvee haue related: and so Adam fel not by his owne fault, necessitie

Luth. de seruo arb.

Calu. l. 1. Inst. c. 18. sect. 3.

Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 23. sect. 7. & 8. & sup. c. 2.

excusing him, but by Gods will and decree, and so by his fault, if there were any fault. if he say that euerie one, by his owne fault fel into this weakenes, then either he meaneth by his owne original, or his own actual sinne. If he say by his original sinne, *Calum* 3. Inst. c. will tell him that it can not proceed of vs 3. sect. 7. that wee are al born in sinne and subiect to damnation, *sed admirabili Dei consilio*, but *from the admirable Counsel of God*: and so man fel not by his owne fault into original sinne. If he mean actual sinne, that also according to *Calum* is the worke of Gods will and decree, and is not to be imputed to vs a fault, wee being excused by a dominecring necessitie, as aboue is proued out of *Calum*, and 3. 23. in the second chapter. And so if man be fallen into an vnablenes of fulfilling the commaundements, he fel not by his owne fault but Gods fault (if wee beleeue these new maisters) and so God is most cruel to punish man with Hellish tormentes for not fulfilling the commaundementes, which he is not able to fulfill, and without al fault on his parte is become thus vnable.

2. But be it that man by his owne fault fel into this weakenes, yet will not this excuse God from most barbarous cruelnie. Bi-

cause, although God might iustlie punish the sinner for the first fault which thus dis-abled him, yet, after mans fall into this impotencie and weakenes, if God still cõmaund him to keep the cõmaundementes, he being not nowyable, God is most vnreasonable, and if he punish him also in hellish torment, he is most cruel and tirannical. As for example, he that by surfet at *Shrofetid*, bringeth such weakenes & sicknes on him selfe, that he can not, without hazard of his life, fast in lent, though he may iustlie be blamed and punished for the surfet, and the more because it made him vnable: yet, that afterwards in his sicknes he fast not, he is not to be blamed: and if the Bishop would excõmunicate him, or otherwise punish him for not fasting, he should be vnreasonable, cruel, and vnmercifull. Or if *Sotcliff* having dronke a cuppe of *Magis*, should fall into some pitte or myne in *Cornwal*; although hee were iustlie to be blamed for having caused this fal by voluntarilie intoxicating his head which should haue better ruled his body and guided his feet, yet to cõmaund him to come forth when he can not, were madnes, & to punish him for not coming forth, were *Scithian* & *Dionisia* cruelties. Or if *Sotcliff*, by

Examples to teach Sotcl.

ill

ill behauiour, or by a maime receyued in some rash attempt or assault, had growyn vnable to serue in warre, or to march on foote with his fellowy souldiours: although for this disabling him selfe, he had been vworthy blame, yet if his captain had commaunded him to march, he hauing no legges at all, or those quite lame; as *Sotcliff* had been blameles in not obeying, so had his Captain been vnreasonable, and if he had also basted him vvith a *bastmado*, he had been barbarously cruel. And so ether *Sotcliff* must graunte with Catholiques, that by grace which Christe hath bestowved on vs, vvee are able to fulfill the commaundements, or else my conclusion must needs followv: to vvit, that according to this nevv doctrin, God is a cruel Tyrant, in punishing vs so seuerlie, for not obeying hvves impossible: and this doctrine must be blasphemous, vvhich maketh God so cruel, he being so mercifull that he is mercie it selfe, and so iuste also that he is iustice it selfe: bicause as Plutarch saith: *non assidet Ioui iustitia sed ipse est iustitia: iustice doth not sit by God, but he is iustice it selfe.* Plut. I de doctrina Princip.

## The somme of the fifte chapter.

ALL heretikes ether directlie or indirectly do deny some thing belonging, or do affirm some thing not belonging to Christes diuinitie: and seing that God is so indiuisible in al perfection, that what soeuer is in him, is God: as an indiuisible point cā not be touched, but al his touched and cānot loose any thing, vnlesse it loose all: So nothing can be denyed of God but al is denyed, nothing can be vnknown but al is vnknown, as the Philosopher hath obserued. And seing that our reformers though they hold some thinges of God trulie, yet as aboue vve haue seen, do make God an euil God, a sinner, an vnreasonable, and cruel Prince, and do vvorship also that God vvhom they acknowledge by their doctrin: they are al Idolatours vvho vvorship a false God, the true God being no such thing: and so as much as in them lyeth, they haue pulled the true God out of his Throne, and haue placed there an euil, vnreasonable, and cruel God, vvhich is not God, but an idol of their ovvn imagination.

Acts 17. 29. Mat. 6. 22.

SOTCLIFF.

SOtcliff answvereth that if this be true, then Papists are as grosse idolators, as they are *Symonian*, *Carpocratian*, *Collyridian*, *Angelican*, *Manichean*, and *Pelagian* heretikes.

but I having cleared them of these heresies a fol. 113.
in the second booke, this was but a bragge
in steed of a blow. he addeth that Papists
*giue gods honor to creatures, and worship the Sa-*
*crament, Stockes and stones idolatrously.* but this
also being aboue answered, &c. was a sen-
seles stocke or block, to bring it in again. fol.
*Finallie* (saith he, and this only he saith to this
chapter) *if wee haue cleared our selues from al*
*the iniust imputatios of this Sycophant & shewed*
*that neither Caluin, nor any of our teachers do hold,*
*that God is Author of sinne &c. then I hope the*
*very Papists them selues, wilbe ashamed to heare*
*such blasphemous termes proceed from their tea-*
*chers &c.* But if you haue not cleared your
selues from making God, an euil God, as
being Authour of sinne, vnreasonable and
cruel, as punishing vs for not keeping his
impossible præceptes: then I hope our Prin-
ce so learned, our Counsel so wise, our na-
tion once so Religious, will abiure and abre-
nounce this Religion, which puttes downe
the true God, without whom, can be noe
Religion, and hath set vp a false God, bad,
vnreasonable, and cruel, whose worship
must needes be worship of a false God, and
consequentlie idolatrie, not Religion.

# THE TITLE OF THE SIXT BOOKE.

*The Sixt booke contriueth a Surucy of their doctrin concerning Princes authoritie and lawes &c.*

## The Somme of the first chapter.

*THE chapter hauing proued how authoritie of Princes proceedeth from God and nature, by meanes of the peoples election, proueth by scriptures and reason, that we are bound in conscience to obey Princes lawes when they commaund nothing against God or Religion. But Luther and Caluin auouch that no lawes of men bynde in conscience: and according to that, they and their followers haue stirred vp subiectes to rebellion. Out of this doctrine is first inferred, that Princes in vaine do commaund, because if the subiectes bee not bound in conscience, they may refuse to obey. Secondlie that Princes are no superiours: because if the subiect bee not bound*

*in conscience, to obey, he is not subiect in cõscience, but as free as he that hath no maister, wherfore Calvin sayth; nous concluons qu'elles (consciences des fideles) sont franches & exẽptes de la puissance de tous hommes. If not subiect to the Prince, then is not the Prince his superiour, and consequently no Prince: because no subiect no superiour, no superiour, nor King nor Prince.*

Calvin lib. 3. ca. 19. §. 14. Edit. Gal an. 1562.

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

SOtcliff to this argument answereth only this; to wit, *that they deny not Princes lawes do bynde in conscience, as oft as they commaund any thing commaunded in Gods word, or prohibit but thinges by God prohibited.* And this is all in effect he answereth to the argument. But I hauing cited *Luthers* and *Calvins* wordes not only in this chapter of the *Survey*, but also about in the Second chapter of the third booke of this my *Replye*, fol. 240. by which it appeareth that they in expresse termes affirme, that Princes lawes can not bynde vs in conscience: my two or three conclusions deduced out of this their principle, still stande in force. And so Princes commaund in vayn, and are no superiours, yea Sotcliff that sayth (but vvithally) that *they deny not Princes lawes do bynde in conscience*, teacheth him selfe that

Sotc. c. 9. pag. 77. l. 26.

Luth. l. de libert. Christ. & comment in ep. Gal. & in cap. 2. ep. 1. Pet. Cal. l. 3. Inst. c. 19. § 2. 3. 14. & lib. 4. ca. 10. § 5.

they bynd not. for first he sayth that if Princes commaund that vvhich is othervvise commaunded in Gods lavv, it byndeth in conscience, insinuating, that otherwise they bynd not, and so Princes can only see that Gods lavves may be kept, but can make no humain lavves binding in conscience: yea although Princes commaund what is othervvise commaunded in Gods lavve, yet shal they commaund in vayne also, because euen Gods lavv, according to *Luther* and *Caluin* & their Schollers, byndes not in conscience (as aboue *fol.* 240. I haue shevved out of their vvordes and doctrine) and so euen then also, they may bee disobeyed, and consequentlie commaund in vayne, and are no superiours, vvee being not subiect to them in conscience, but as free from them, as he that hath no maister. Secondly he sayth *pag.* 77. *lin.* 31. *that vvhere Luther and Caluin defend Christian mens libertie touching their conscience, they say no other thing then that vvhich they haue learned, and vvhich euery man may gather out of S. Iames chap.* 4. *there is one lavvgiuer that can saue and destroy.* So that *Sotel* confesseth that God is not only the principall lavvgiuer, but also the sole lavvgiuer, that can bynde in conscience: vvhence followeth that Prin-

ces can not bynd vs in conſcience, and conſequentlie commaund in vayne, and are indeed no ſuperiours, as I haue alreadie deduced.

2. *Sotcliff* hauing no more to ſay to the drift of my argument, blotteth the reſt of his paper, to ſhevv tvvoe thinges. The firſt is hovv much they giue to Princes, and hovv litle vvee Catholikes doe. The ſecond is to free *Luther*, the *Lutherans*, and *Caluniſtes*, charged by me to haue ſtirred vp rebellion. Cõcerning the firſt he ſayth, that firſt *they ſay it is not lavvfull for any ſubiect to lay violent handes vppon their annointed Kinges, the Papiſts are taught to rebell againſt Princes excommunicated by the Pope* &c. But if he peruſe the booke of dangerous poſitions ſet forth by a pillar of his Church, he ſhal finde that the *Puritanes* (vvhom *Sotcliff* aboue excludeth not from his Church) are not of his opinion. And if the Prince or ſtate vvere as contrarie to proteſtauntes and their Biſhops and eccleſiaſtical ſtate, as to *Puritanes*, they would ſay, as Puritanes doe. *Buchanan* ſayth, *penes populum eſt vt leges ſeruent, ſunt Reges veluti Tabulariorum cuſtodes*: he teacheth alſo that it vvere good that reyvardes vvere propoſed by the people to ſuch as vvould kill tyran-

about in the 2. booke chap. 6.

Buch. de iure Regni.

res; he addeth that the people may arraign the Prince, and that he who by excommunicatiō is cast into Hel, is not worthy to enioy any life vppon Earthe. *Goodman* in his booke of obedience, sayth *that* vvas no traytour, that sought to lay violent handes on Queen Marie, vvhether deposed by her subiectes nor excommunicated by the Pope, yea he extolleth him to the skies as one that dyed in defence of Religiō; and if Sotcliff except against this booke, her reiecteth th Antonius of his primatiue Church of *Geneua*, for *Martinge Dotne* of *Dunlad*, in his præface to *Goodmans* booke, sayth this booke vvas approued by the best in *Geneua*, to vvit by *Caluin* for *Caluin* sayth, that vvicked Princes do despoile them selues of Authoritie, and are vnvvorthie to bee accounted in the nomber of men: and therfore vvee must rather Spit vppon their heades then obey them. *Beza* defendeth rebellion against Princes of a different religion. The *Puritanes* or *Hugonottes* of *Fraunce*, in their congregation artic. 4. auoucheth the same. *Knox* in the historie of *Scotland* sayth, that if Princes be tyrantes against God and his truth, subiectes are freed from their oathes of allegiance, yea he sayth Princes for iust causes may bee de-

cap 14.

Caluin in cap 6 Dan. vers. 22. 25.

Beza ep. dedicat. nou test. an. 1564.

posed. All which doctrin Sanderus shal fynde in the booke of dangerous positiõs. Luther, as Sleidan l. 8. hath tronicled, sayth the Almains might iustlie make warr against Charles the fifte in defence of Lutherianisme. Zuinglius taught and held the same, in defence of Zuinglianisme. And al this doth necessarilie follow that common receaued doctrin amongest them, that Princes lawes bynde not in conscience: for thence I haue inferred, that then no man is subiect to Princes in conscience, and so may rebel and deny obedience, at his pleasur. And so the questiõ is not whether Princes that tyrannize against the Church, may be deposed, but whether the Pope and the Catholique Church may depose them rather then protestauntes or Puritants. for according to the doctrin of Lutherans and Caluinistes, not only when they tyrannize, but also when they gouerne best wee may deny them obedience, as being not subiecte to them in cõscience: and seing a subiecte and superiour are Correlatiues, of which one inferreth or denyeth the other: if subiectes may free them selues al, frõ obedience, as being not subiecte in conscience, they may make them selues no subiectes, and consequentlie the Prince no su-

Zuing. ll. 4. epi. fol. 186. & Anti. 42. Expla. fol. 84.

periour; vvhich is to say in effect, that they may depose him, not only in case of Tyrannie against the Church, but also at their vvill and pleasur. Novv, as for Catholikes, they teach that Princes lawes bynde in conscience, & that euē difficile and euil Princes are to be obeyed as I haue proued in this Chapter of my *Survey*, and aboue in the first booke and first Chapter of this my *Reply* fol. And neuer shal *Sotcl.* read in Catholikes bookes such dangerous Positions as I haue rehearsed out of his Doctours vvritinges. He may read, that in some extraordinarie insolencie of a Prince against the Church and faith, the Pope may excommunicate and depose him, and that he being deposed, is not of necessitie to bee obeyed, bicause he that *vvill not heare the Church* is to be *esteemed as an Ethnike*, (to vvhom the Ievves acknovvledged noe obedience) *and a Publican*, with vvhom they vvould haue no conuersation. He may read that Tyrantes vvho are Inuasours, may be resisted and killed of euerie priuat man, bicause al the Realm and euery priuat subiect hath iust warre against them: and he may reade in some Cath. vvriters, yea prophane Philosophers, that in case of intolerable Tyrannie, the people may depose the Prince

Mat. 18.

that vvas lavvfullie crovvned, though some also deny this: but that either *Pope*, or common vvealth, can depose a Prince at their pleasur, yea or for euery Tyrannical lavv or action, he shall neuer read: much lesse shall he read, such scandalous and dangerous positions, as I haue related out of his Doctours, vvhich also are conformable to their doctrine.

5. *Secondly* (saith Sote.) *vvee say that the King is not subiect to any forrain Potentate* &c. neither do Catholikes say he is subiect to any forrain Potentate, no not to the *Pope*, in temporal matters. And therfore so longs as the King encrocheth not præpostetrouslie and intolerably vppon the Church & faith, the Pope can not do any thing against him. But, as vvee teach and proue, that the Pope is the Suprem visible head of the Church vnder Christe, so vvee say that the King if he bee a Christian, is a subiect of his in Spiritual matters: vvhich subiection al Kings Christian acknowledge to this day (as vve experience in the Kinges of Fraunce and Spaine) and yet thinke them selues as absolut Kinges as the King of Ingland. *Constantine* the Great and (bee it spoken with a reseruation of dew respect) greater then euer vvas any king of

ex Ruff l. 1. c. 1. England, acknowledged this subiection to Pope Siluester, yea to his Legates and Bishops of the Counsell of Nice, saying: Deus vos constituit Sacerdotes &c. God hath made you Priests, and hath giuen you power to iudge also of vs, and therefore we are rightly iudged of you: and a little after he giues the reason, nos enim nobis Deos dari est indignum &c. For you are giuen to vs as Goddes from God, and it is not conuenient that a man should iudge Goddes; but he alone of whom it is written, God stood in the Synagogue of Goddes, iudging them in the mids. The same subiection Valentinian, Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius acknowledged: and so did all our Christian kinges till Henry the 8. and yet liued and raigned gloriously and securely, and thought themselues as much kinges as King Henry the 8: did: yea the first of all our Kinges called Christes Vicar vpon earth the supreme head of the Church of England, & abrogated al Papal authoritie.

Thirdly (saith Sotel) it is true that the Kinges lawes concerning Ecclesiastical matters are to be obeyed &c. But the Puritanes and your brethren of Helueti, Zurich, Berne, Geneua, Polonia, Hungaria and Scotland, will allow the King no Spiritual Iurisdiction: yea the Puritanes deny this authoritie to your Bishops

and will haue it to reside onlie in their Classes or congregations of Ministers: and therfore do pronounce your Ecclesiastical Gouernment in England *Antichristian, deuilish, but little better then that of the Samaritanes. Caluin* him selfe, although he confesse that it vvas Heroicallie done in King *Henne* the 8. to deliuer *Ingland*, from the Tyrannie of the Pope (so he calles it) yet for arrogating authoritie in Ecclesiastical matters he condemned him as *deterior omnibus alijs mancipijs Antichristi*, vvorse then al the bond slaues of Antichriste. And again (saith hee) *qui in initio tantopere extulerunt Henricum Regem Angliæ, certè fuerunt inconsiderati homines &c. They vvho in the beginning did so much extolle Henrie the King of England, certes they vvere inconsiderate men, they gaue him supreme authoritie ouer al thinges, and thus did alvvay grieuouslie vvound mee: for they vvere blasphemous vvhe they called him the Suprem head of the Church vnder Christe.* And this the *Caluinistes & Puritanes* of *Ingland*, vvill make good against al *Protestaunts*, by Scriptures, Ecclesiastical histories, practise of the Church, and reason. They vvill say that Christ cõmaunded Apostles only, nor Kinges to feed his sheep & gouern his Church. They vvould if they durst bring in the terrible example

Admoni. to the Parlament.

Caln in c. 1. Amos.

Caln. in c. 7. Amos.

Io 21. Eph. 4.

of Ozias, stricken with a leprie for atrogating Priestlie authoritie: and they vvould not let to speake in Azarias vvordes, if it vvere permitted them, euen to a king: *non est tui officij Ozia, vt adoleas incẽsum domino &c. It is not thy office Ozias to offer incẽse to our Lord, but it is the office of Priests, who are cõsecrated to such a ministerie: depart out of the Sanctuarie, disdain not to depart, for this will bee counted no glorie to the before our Lord God.* 2. Par. 26. Vvhat? a king to entremeddle in Ecclesiastical matters vvhich appertain to Priests, which are cõsecrated to that end: depart ô king, out of the Sanctuarie, cõmaund noe more in the Church, if thou vvilt commaund lõge & prosperouslie in thy kingdõ. Condemne not this admonition, it vvill neuer bee thy honour, to atrogate this Honour. Al the ancient Christian Kinges so mightie in armes, so noble of birth, so riche in treasur, so fortunate in warres, so glorious in victories, so zealous in Christian Religiõ, thought it their honour to be defenders, not rulers of the Church, Subiectes in spiritual matters no Supetiours, Sheepe no Pastours, Children no Fathers: and therfore submitted their crovvn to the Miter, their Scepter to the pastoral staffe, & their kingdõ to the Church: It vvil not bee honour to a

king before God or man, to chalẽge to him ſelfe this Honour. It is an honour in deed, & as much Greater, then Imperial dignitie, as it is more to rule ſoules, thẽ bodies; but it is no honour to a king, nether vvill it turn to the Proſperitie or ſecuritie, of him or his Poſteritie. The kinges of *Spayne*, *Fraunce*, and *Ingland*, yea al Chriſtian Emperours, euer from *Conſtantine* the *Great*, haue contented, them ſelues with Regal and Imperial dignitie, and vvhat ſhoulde novv a king vndertake Eccleſiaſtical Povver? If he vvil haue God for his Father, let him acknovvledge the Church for his mother, him ſelfe, in this kind, a ſonne no father, a Subiect no Superiour? Harkẽ not to the flatterers of this age, that giue thee more authoritie then God hath euer giuen thee, they adore thy purple not thee, and they reſpect their ovvn intereſt not thy true dignitie or honour. Thus would they ſay, and the *Caluiniſtes* in *Geneua*, *Fraunce*, and *Scotland*, the *Lutheranes* in *Germanie*, & the *Zuinglians* in *Zuizzerland*, would ſecond them. And they vvould ſay in the heate of their Spirit, as *S. Ambroſe*, not Pope, but Biſhip only of *Milan*, ſayd to *Valentinian* the Emperour: *quando audiſti Clementiſſime* &c. *vvhen diddeſt thou heare, moſt Clemẽt King,* Ambr. ep. 32.

that lay men, in causa fidei, vvere Bishops Iudges? Do not trouble thy selfe, to thinke that thou hast
ep. 33. any imperial right in diuine matters. do not arroll thy selfe, but if thou vvilt raign longer, bee subiect to God. it is vvritten, giue to God that vvhich is his, and to Cæsar vvhat belonges to Cæsar. to the King Pallaces Pertain: to the Priest, Churches.
they vvould adioine yet, the vvordes of that
Hosius Cord ad Constan. courageous Bishop *Hosius*, vvhich hee spake to *Constantius* the Arrian Emperour, vvho also would bee medling in Councels and Ecclesiastical affaires: *desine quæso & memineris &c. leave of I pray thee, and remember thou art a mortal man, feare the day of Iudgement, Keep thy selfe for that day pure and immaculate, entermedle not thy selfe in ecclesiasticall affaires, neither do thou commaund vs in this Kind, but rather learn those thinges of vs, ô King.* Thus vvould they say, if they vvere permitted, and being backed vvith this auctioritie, they vvould put our Minister *Sotcliff*, vvho flatters for a Bishopricke, to mumming silence.

5. *Fourthly* (sayth Sotc.) *vvee say that not only lay men, but also al Masse Priests, mõkes, and freers, ought to be subiect to the Prince, those fellowes exept*
Gen. 47. *their clergie &c.* But, Sir, In the lavv of natur, by *Ioseph* and *Pharao*, in *Ægypt* the Priests were exempted. In the lavv vvritten the Priests

and

and Leuites vvere priuiledged by Gods cō-maundement. The king of the Persiās freed them from tribut. and this they did for honour and respect they bare to Priesthood: and in the new law, not vvithstanding that Christe sayth *the Children of Kinges* (that is as S. Austin expoundeth clergie men) *pay not tribut*, yet *Sotcliff* vvill not haue them exempted. And if he meane his clergie, see hath reason, bicause they are nether Priests nor Clerkes as aboue I haue proued. And although Priestlie authoritie do farre excel the Royaltie, although Priests bee the Kings Pastours, and of an higher court, and so should not bee summoned to Inferiour tribunals, nor punished by temporal magistrates, yet *Sotcliff* vvithout al respect of their degree, coate, & order, vvil haue them drawn to secular tribunals to pay tributes no lesse then the lay people, and so vvill prophane that vvhich is consecrated to God. But if Constantine the Great, as *Sozomen* vvriteth *gaue to clerkes euerie where immunitie*, vvhich *Sozomen* calleth, *plane maximū reuerentiæ erga religionem argumentū, a most great signe of his reuerēce towardes Religion*: and Cōstans, Iustinian, *Honorius, Valentinian, Theodosius*, and *Archadius*, haue enlarged and confirmed, and the Ciuil

Num. 18. 24. 1. Esd. 7.

Mat. 17. Aug. li. 11. quest. Exod. cap. 28.

Aboue booke 2. chap. 1.

Soz. lib. 1. cap. 9.

and Canon lavv haue subscribed vnto this exemption: vvho gaue Sotcl. authoritie to cal them to account for it. Or vvhy should the Clergie refuse this exemption, it being graunted by so glorious Emperours, and for reuerence tovvardes their coate, order, and office?

Cod. Theodos. de Epis. & Cler. l. 1. & 2. 9. Iust. in Auten. const. 79. 83. 111. Honor. ep. ad Archad. tit. in cod. Cale act. 1. cap. quãquam de cõsti. in 6. cap. 3. Nouimus de Immunit. Eccl. & c. 3. Imperator d. 96.

6. *Finallie* (sayth Sotc.) *wee make Princes and Kinges Soueraign cõmaunders ouer their subiectes and immediate Exequutors of Gods lavves. Contrarie wise the Papists make them most base exequutioners of the Popes lawes &c.* So do Catholikes also make the Soueraign cõmaunders ouer their subiectes & next to God in their Kind, in so much that the Pope is no Superiour of theirs in civil and temporal matters: and so if they encroch not on the Churches right or faith, the Pope can not molest thé. Vvee say also that they are to see Gods lawes kept and that they carrie the svvord for that purpose. And vvee do not cal them exequutioners of the Popes lavves, only vvee say that they must bee defenders of the Church, and when it concerneth the Church, they must vse their temporal svvord by the direction of the Pope. for vvhich cause S. *Bernard* calleth the Princes svvord the Popes svvord, bicause in that case, the king ought to drawe

Bern. lib. 4 de consid ad Eugen cap. 3.

it at the Popes Counsel: *vterque ergo Ecclesiæ, & spiritualis scilicet gladius & materialis: sed ille quidem pro Ecclesia, hic vero ab Ecclesia exercendus: ille Sacerdotis, ut militis manu, sed sanè ad nutū Sacerdotis, & iussum imperatoris:* both swordes (sayth he) *pertain to the Church, to wit the spiritual and material or temporal sword, but that is to bee drawyn for the Church, this also by the Church, that by the Priests hand, this by the hand of the souldiour, but yet at the becke of the Priest, and the commaundement of th' Emperour.* And in this case, the ancient kinges of Fraunce Spain, Ingland, and the Catholike Emperours from Constantine, haue drawyn their swordes for the Church at the becke of the Pope: yea this they promised when they were Sacred, and yet counted them selues as absolute Kinges, as the later Princes of Ingland.

7. As cõcerning the second office which I sayd Sotc. performeth, to wit, his clearing of *Luther* and others: he sayth, *it is false that Luther exhorted the Germanes, not to take armes against the Turke.* he addeth that he *was not subiect of King Henrie the 8. and so dealt more freelie with him, being set on also by papists:* he sayth also that they *defend not the Boores rebellion in Germanie, nether did Luther spare to reproue them,*

though the cause of their insurrection was not Religion. The Germanes and States of the low countries are able to cleare themselues: The Christians in France never rebelled but only tooke armes in defence of their liues against such as brake the Kinges Edict: and therfore haue been iustified by the Kinges themselues. But how wel he hath dealt in al these pointes it must be better examined. Let *Luther* speake first. *Mendaces & obstinati sunt principes nostri, nec homines ratione prediti, sed Germanicæ bestiæ, &c.* Our Princes are lyers and obstinate, noe men indewed with reason, but Germain beastes. I beseech al godlie Christians that they would vouchsafe to pray to God for those miserable blinded Princes, by whom without doubt, God hath chastised vs in the great furie of his anger, that in no wise wee obey them, or goe to warfare, or giue any thing against the Turck. The Turck is ten tymes honester, and wiser then our Princes. what prosperous thing can happen to such fooles against the Turck?

ep. cont. duo. Cæsaris Edicta.

Tel vs now, Sir Deane, is it not true that I sayd? to wit, that *Luther* speaketh contemptibly of Princes, and exhorteth not to take armes against the Turcke. other his contemptible speeches I had related against *Charles* the fifte, and especiallie against *Henrie* the 8. whereas *Sotcliff* excuseth *Luthers* impu-

ep. 1. post duo Cæsar. Edict. & lib. cont. Regem Angliæ.

dencie against King *Henrie* the 8. bicause he vvas not his subiect, it is a verie slender excuse, seing that reuerence is dew euen to Extern Princes. As for the *States of the low countrie*, hovv vvel they cleared them selues, it appeareth by their *Edict* extaunt in their Historie, printed at Fracfort in the yeare 1583. in vvhich they declare the king of Spayn, vvho vvas their natural Prince, to haue lost al right and Title to those countries, by his tyrannie, and therfore forbid al vse of his name & Seale. And so that vvhich *Sotcloff* so much misliketh in the Pope, to vvit deposition of Kinges, he seeth practised in these States. The French Hugonots are likevvise ignorantlie or impudentlie excused. for they vvere punished by Henrie the second, and Frauncis the secōd his sonne for rebelles and makers of vnlavvfull assemblies, diuers yeares before the Edict of libertie of conscience came forth: the first Edict being published in the yeare 1561. in the moneth of March, before vvhich tyme, these Hugonots had made many seditious assemblies, yea had conspired and complotted the kinges death at *Amboise*, as is euident out of *Surius*, *Genebrad*, *Belforest*, *Laual*, *Pighier*, and *Poplinar* vvho haue vvritten of the broyles

in Fraunce. I could adde the broyles in Scotland for confirmation of the reformers loyaltie. for, were not the ministers in feeld with th' Earles of *Angush*, *Marre*, & others, against his maiestie that now raigneth? did they not chase his mother out of the countrie? did they not abuse his minoritie and tender yeares? let him selfe speake who best knoweth. And although I will not deny but that Catholike subiectes haue some tymes rebelled, yet were they not warranted by their doctrine, for that commaundeth loyaltie and allegeaunce. but you and yours, Sir Deane, are warranted by your doctrine to rebell & denye obedience and subiection, at your pleasure, as I haue alreadie declared.

## The Somme of the second chapter.

*After a breif commendation of* Iustice *and Iudges, this chapter shewyeth, howw our reformers bring Iudges and tribunals in contempt. for first if lawes bynd not in conscience, then are none subiect to Princes in conscience, but as free as he that hath no superiour, and so Princes being no superiours, are priuat men, who can not punish malefactours, but only may defend themselues. And so the arraigned may refuse to stand to the Iudges*

*sentence, he being not subiect to him or the King in conscience. Secondly if lawes bynd not, then may the arraigned confesse the fact, and yet deny the fault, because if lawes bynd not in conscience, there is no fault in transgressing lawes, much lesse in refusing to stand to the iudges sentence, which is but a particuler lawe. thirdlie he may plead that he had not free will, and so was not to be blamed for that which was not in his power, much lesse to be punished. Fourthly he may alleage that according to Luther, Melancthon, Caluin, Beza, God was the author & principal cause of his sinne, moving him necessarilie (as about they say) and so can not iustlie be punished for that, in which God had more part then hee, and who moued him to it so forcible, that he could not resist. And these shifts he may haue against the iudge, and so may contemne his sentence.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

SOtcliff. answereth not to this, and his reason is, *because the Collection is so simple and Foppish, that it falleth of it selfe.* Yet he iumbleth with much a do at an answer to the first argument, saying: that *they hold Princes lawes grounded in Gods lawe do bynd in conscience.* But how they say that euen those lawes

do not bynd in conscience, I haue related in the beginning of the former chapter. Vvherfore not daring to stand to this, he sayth at least Princes lavves bynde men to sustein the punishment. But seing that punishment is due to sinne only, if the lavv bynde not, they sinne not, and so may refuse the punishment: especiallie penal lavves bynding, at least no more in cõscience, then other lavves do. To the 2. argument he answereth not any thing, imagining to haue answvered it in the first. To the third he saith *that though man hath not free vvill to do vvorkes pleasing God, yet he hath free vvil to do levvdlie.* But in this answvere he graunteth lesse then scriptur doth, vvhich biddes vs decline *from evil, and do good*, and more then *Calun*, vvho (as vvee haue seen aboue in the former booke and 2. chapter) auerreth gods vvill to bee a necessitie of al thinges, and that the deuil and man sinne of necessitie: and so al sinners are to be excused not punished, bicause, as *Optatus* sayth, *voluntas penam habet, necessitas veniam*. To the fourth argument he answereth *mumme*: and so my argument standing stil in force, I vvill again inferre, that iudges and tribunals must fall, if the Reformers, in this doctrine, keep their standing.

L. 7. cont. Parm.

## The ſomme of the third chapter.

*LAvves being commended and the force of them declared, out of the reformers opinion vvhich teacheth that they bynd not in conſcience, are deduced theſe ſequels. Firſt that lavves are no lawes, bicauſe if they bynd not, they differ not from exhortation and Counſell. Secondly, that promiſes and contractes bynd not, they being but particuler lavves, made* ex conuentione partium. *Thirdly that the commaundements of parentes and maiſters bynd not, they being alſo but particuler lawes. Fourthly that the* 10. *commaundements bynde not Chriſtians: which Luther and Caluin graunt alſo, Chriſtians, as they ſay, being freed from them in cõſcience. Fourthly that thus al lavves and cõmaundementes are brought in contempt. for as the coalite cares not to be tyed in ſilke threedes, becauſe ſuch bandes can not hold him: ſo Chriſtians being perſvvaded that lavves bynd not in conſcience, may and vvill make no ſcruple to tranſgreſſe them. To ſay that at leaſt for feare of ſcandal* vvee muſt *keep the lawes, vvil not ſuffice: for then I demaund vvhat is meant by that,* muſt? *If an obligation in conſcience, then Chriſte hath not freed vs from al lavves: If a congruitie only, then it is but an incongruitie to tranſgreſſe lavves: and ſo the Princes*

Calu. li. 3. Inſt. cap. 19. §. 2. & 14. Cal. l. 4 Inſt. c. 10.

*lawes are brought into contempt: and the Prince can haue no securitie amongest such lawles subiectes, who are persuaded that no law byndeth them in conscience to allegeaunce.*

## The Somme of the 4. chapter.

*SOcietie, to which man is naturallie bent, consisteth in ruling, obeying, and complying. in ruling of the superiour, obeying of th'inferiour to his superior, and complying with his fellow subiect. and these 3. partes of ciuilitie, are maintained by one, to wit, trust or confidence. for if the superiour who can not do al by himselfe, rely not on his subiectes he shal neuer rule a right, and if they put no trust in him, they will neuer willinglie obey: if they trust not one another, they shal euer liue in distrust of one another. Now, if lawes bynd not in conscience, what confidence can the Prince put in his subiectes, or they in him, no law holding them from rebellion, him from oppression? If lawes bynd not in conscience, neither do marriages, nor contractes, nor promises, which are particuler lawes: and so the Husband shal liue in iealousie of his wife, she of him, no law bynding them to law of marriage: The parentes shal not bee sure of their Children, nor they of them, promises made betweene fellow subiectes, will not be performed, contra-*

*ties vvilbe broken, and so no commerce nor traffike can stand, and euery one vvill stand in feare of another, hoe lavve bynding them in conscience from doing mischeefe: and so societie and ciuil conuersation being ruined, euerie one must retyre himselfe to the vvilderness: and this doctrin can not bee of God, vvhich is so opposite to societie, vvhich is of God and natur.*

*Sotcliffes answver to these tvvoe chapters.*

1. The Minister by practise hauing gotten a facilitie (*as vsus promptos facit*) answvereth tvvo chapters vvith one breath: but because he seeth he can not answver them, vnlesse he graunt that lavves bynd in cõscience, he affirmeth, against his conscience, that they hold lavves as bynding in conscience: for I haue aboue in the first chapter of this booke, and the secõd chapter of the third booke, made it known, that they hold that no lavves, not so much as diuine lavves since Christe, do bynde in conscience, and haue proued that they also must say so, if they vvill speake conformablie. for if faith only iustifie, then I demaund vvhether a faithfull man may cõmitt fornication, theft or murder? If he may, as it can not be de-

nyed but he may: then I aske vvhether by such crimes he loseth his faith or noe? If answer be made that he loseth it: then by euerie sinne a Christian becometh an infidel: If he loseth not faith, then, faith iustifying, he remaineth still iust, not vvithstanding fornication theft &c. If he remain still iust, hauing done against the law: then hath he not sinned or his sinne is not imputed, and so the lavv byndeth not in conscience, it being reputed no more sinne to do against the lavv, then against our æqualles counsel, vvch byndeth not in conscience. Vvherfore Sotc: not trusting to this answer, and hauing alvvayes 2. strinnges to his bowe, sayth, that *besides matter of conscience ciuil lavves do sufficientlie keep themselues from cõtempt by diuers sortes of ciuil punishmẽts:* (and so saith he) *his frapling out-courses touch vs nothing.* But, vvhen the malefactour can escape by subtiltie, these ciuil punishments, what holdeth the subiect from mischeefe, or from breaking promises? And what bridle hath the Prince who is not to suffer the paine of the lawe? And what careth the rich or potent malefactour, who by bribes or force vvill auoid the punishment: in vvhich respect *Anacharsis* cõpared lavves to spiders vvebbes, vvhich take only flyes,

Plut. in Solone.

whilest the great-ones, breake through the. Certes (as *Cicero* saith) *who feares nothing but a Iudge and a witnesse, what will he not do in the darke, or when he fyndes a weake and riche man alone, of whom he may haue the spoile?* Cicer. de Leg.

Wherfore *Sotcliff* hauing not been able to deny that principle of theirs, *Lawes bynd not in conscience*: my conclusion necessarilie followeth, to wit, that by this doctrine lawes are brought in contempt, and al ciuil societie is ruined.

2. *Sotcliff* therfore not able to defend him selfe setteth on vs furiouslie & desperatelie. *But admit* (saith he) *the wicked and damnable doctrin of Poperie, and giue the Pope leaue to excommunicate Princes, then subiectes are assoiled from their fealtie and obedience, oathes are broken, lawes are troden vnder feet, Kinges are murthered rebellions raysed* &c. But this furie breakes it selfe like a waue against the rocke, and makes more against *Sot.* and his Ministers, as aboue wee haue seen. For many of them hold expresselie that Princes may be deposed and killed, and they al vse to excommunicate lay men, and so would they the Prince, if they durst, and the Puritanes would say, that they may do as y^e^ wel one as the other. because the Prince, though in temporal mat- aboue ch. first.

ters he haue no Superiour, yet in ſpiritual matters (would thē y ſay) he is ſubiect to the Church, and Prelate, as much as others, and ſo if he perſequute the Church, he may by excōmunication be cut of as an infected and infecting member. So (vvould they ſay) *Basilas* not Pope, but Biſhop of *Antioche*, excōmunicated *Philip* y^e^ firſt Chriſtiā Emperour vvhom ſome cal *Numerius* ſo *S. Ambroſe* excommunicated *Theodoſius*, S. *Innocentius* the firſt Pope of that name, excommunicated *Archadius* the *Emperour*, and *Eudoxia* the *Empereſs*, for baniſhing and perſequuting S. *Ihon Chryſoſtom*: ſo *Symmachus* excommunicated *Anaſtaſius*, ſo *Nicholas* the firſt excommunicated *Lotharius* and *Michael*, both Emperours? So other Popes and Biſhops haue excommunicated almoſt innumerable Kinges and Princes. Thus vvould the Puritanes ſay: but how modeſt the Catholikes doctrine is in this point, vvhich teacheth that Popes can not excommunicate Princes but for great crimes, nor depoſe them but for intolerable vſurpation on the Church, or perſequution of the faith, vvee haue ſeen aboue. Certes, as Catholikes ſay Princes may be depoſed in caſe of intolerable tyrannie againſt the Church, and not elſe, ſo they ſay that in

Chryſo. in vita Babile. Soz. l. 7. c. 24. Theodor. l. 5. c 17. Ambr. l 5. ep. 28. Niceph. l. 13. c. 34.

Aboue chap. firſt.

case of hereſie or like Tyrannie, the Pope may be depoſed. And if for this extraordinarie caſe, *Sotcliff* may inferre, that Princes are in no ſuertie amongeſt Catholikes (whereas yet the King of *Fraunce* and *Spayn*, think them ſelues as ſure and ſecure as the King of *Ingland*) then may he inferre alſo that Princes are not in ſecuritie in their Realmes, becauſe many hold, that in caſe of intolerable Tyrannie, the common vvelth may depoſe them: and much leſſe are ſubiectes in ſecuritie, vvho may be hanged for murder, and hanged dravon and quartered for treaſon? Vvhy then doth not *Sotcliff* leaue his countrie as a place not ſecure? If he anſvver, that he is ſecure becauſe he is ſure, that he ſhal not ſo be vſed, vnleſſe he play the Traitour or malefactour: then vvill I tell him, that the Prince amngeſt vs, is in greater ſecuritie, becauſe he can not be depoſed for euerie great crime, but only for intolerable Tyrannie againſt the Church, or extraordinarie inſolencie. But amongeſt you (Sir Sotc) vvhat ſecuritie cā he haue, ſeing that you alſo hold that he may be excommunicated, and that vvarre may be made againſt him in defence of religiō, and haue practiſed alſo this doctrine in *Ingland*, *Scotland*, *Fraunce*, and the *lovv*

countries: yea, who, according to your licentious doctrine, may deny him obedience and depose him at your pleasure, as being in your opinion, not subiect to him in conscience, as aboue vvee haue declared?

KELLISON.

# THE TITLE OF THE SEVENTH BOOKE.

*The seuenth Booke conteyneth a Surucy of the newe doctrin concerning manners.*

## The Somme of the first chapter.

THis Chapter hauing shewed, vvhat great Sway, Hope and feare, do beare in the gouernment of a common vvelth, yea of mans life, and howe neither can be gouerned vvithout them: relateth Caluins opinion, vvhich saith that vvee must not vvorke our good deedes for hope of reward: vvhich being done, setteth downe the diuers kindes of feare, as seruile, humain, filial, and reuerential feare, seruile feare vvhich

Calu. li. 3 Inst. c. 16. §. 3. & c. 18 §. 2. & 10 And. Iesl. c. can. 31. apud Bel.

which is feare of Hel Luther reiecteth in expresse termes: and that, and the other feares, he & Calvin also do take awvay by their doctrine. For if vvee be sure of our election and salvation (as Calvin above saith vvee are) hovv can vvee feare hel, being assured to escape it, as to possess heaven? If lawes bynd not, then it is no sinne in transgressing them, and consequently no paine is to be feared of men for transgressing, and so humain feare is gone. If lawes bynd not, then to trãsgresse is no sinne, if not sinne, no offence, and so filial feare, vvhich feareth to transgresse for feare of offending, is abolished. If nether Gods lawves nor mannes lawves bynde vs, vvee are not subiect to God in conscience, but as free as he that hath no maister, and so vve being no subiectes, though he in nature and diuine essence bee above vs, yet he is not our Superiour in authoritie of commaunding, and so is not to be feared vvith reuerential feare, vvhich reuerenceth authoritie. Soe, Hope and feare being taken awvay the vvay to vertue is stopped, the gate to al vice is open, because hope inciteth to do vvel, feare restraineth from doing evil.

larmin. to. 3. l. 3. de iustif. ca. 8. Luth. p. 8. & in c. 1. Gal. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 16. § 18.

Sorcliffe, answer chap. 10. vvith the Refutation.

1. BEcause this booke proueth that their doctrine looseth the bridle to al vice,

Sotcliff before he answers the first chapter thereof, beginneth with a Proem, by which he would *captare benevolentiam*, and curries fauour with his Reader, perswading him that it is no meruail that I charge their Religion with so fowle a staine; *seeing it hath been of old tyme the custome for Paynims to cry out against Christians as if they were Atheists and the leudest men.* but he complameth more of mee then I deserue, for I do not accuse them (as thee sayth) *of loose carriage and vicious liuing*, only I charge their doctrine of leuvdnes, because it leadeth to al vice, as in euerie chapter of this booke is proued. But to turne his Reader from such a base conceipt of his religion, he setteth downe motiues, which he sayth, his Religion affordeth, as inducers to good life. The first motiue, *is Gods commandement, which vve are to obey.* But if the commandements bynd not in conscience, then are they as vveake motiues to obedience, as they are vveake in bynding. His second motiue is *Gods honour vvhich vvee are to seeke.* But if honour bee in him that honoureth, not in him that is honoured, then, al our actions being damnable sinnes as *Caluin* sayth they are, Caluinists haue but a vveake motiue to do vvel, thereby to honour God, sin-

Sotcliffes motiues to vertue.

The 1.

The 2.

lib. 3. Inst. c. 14. § 7. & cap. 14.

not being so farre from honouring him, that they dishonour and offend him. His third motive is Christes example, which wee are to follow. But seing they teach that Christes example of virginitie and fasting 40. dayes is not to be followed, yea that both his Counsels and commandments are impossible, this is a weakish motive also. The fourth is the Election and vocation of Christians, which requireth a life answerable to our profession. But you professing (as above) that these commandements are impossible, and that wee can do nothing but sinne in our actions, if you will be consequent to your selues, you must dispaire of doing well: and if sinne can be imputed to a faithfull man, as you teach also, then you haue a great mercy to vice, to bring all sinne that shall not be imputed, but no motive by this profession vnto vertue. The fift motive, is the reward promised to those that keep Gods commandements. But you teach that there is no merit, as above we haue seen, & we must confesse there is no reward. Calvin teacheth that wee must not fulfill the commandements for hope of reward, yea or you say the commandements are impossible: which graunted, men will giue vp themselues to keep them for hope of reward, &

The 3.

The 4.

Luth. con. 1. ad Gal. Calu. li. 3. cap. 14. aboue, booke 3 chap. 2. Luth. ser. 11 sic Deus in lexic. Col. l. 3. ca. 14. The. 3.

Sotcliff would besturre him selfe, if the King should promise him to be *Bishop* of *Excester*, if at one leape he would leap from *Excester* to *London*. The sixt motiue is *the scandal that insueth of lewd actions*. But this is no motiue against secret sinnes, which shewing not them selues, can scandalize no man. and if God bee the Authour of sinne, as *Caluin* aboue saith he is, and moueth vs also to sinne so forcibly, that wee cā not resist him, then is no bodie to bee scandalized at Gods worke, especially they being not in the power of the sinner, and so can be to him no sinne, shame, nor blame. The last motiue is *the curse and eternal miserie and punishment, that is denounced against the transgressors of the law*. But if there bee no local hel or no true fier, as *Luther* and *Caluin* say there is not: if the paines of Hel be but a remorse or greefe of cōscience, as Caluin saith; then Hel is not so terrible a scar-crow as commonly it is made: and if the faithfull are sure of heauen (as *Caluin* sayth they are) it is but follie to feare that, which they are sure to escape, and as great a follie were it, as to feare lest the heauens fall on their heades. Yea he that harkneth to those wordes of *Caluin* so full of consolatiō: *Hinc egregia expritur consolatio &c*, *Hence ariseth*

The 6.

The 7.

nbque fol. 381.

lib. 1. Inst. c. 16. § 18.

*an exceeding consolation, that vve heare the iudgement belongs to him who hath alreadie ordained vs to bee consortes of the honour in iudging: so farr it is from him, to mount vp into tribunal to condemne vs:* shal haue litle cause to feare Hel. yea if vvee must not absteyn from sinne for the paynes of hel, this being a seruile feare, vvhich *Luther* and *Caluin* do cõdemne, hovv doth *Sot.* make this a motiue: lastly if Christe at the later day can exercise no part of a iudge according to the nevv doctrin, vvhat need sinners to feare the last iudgemẽt, seing that God is not to condemne any, but by Christe his sonne. And so if the vvord motiue be deriued of mouing, then *Sotcl.* seuen motiues to Holines of life, are no motiues, they being by his doctrin no mouers. And seing that he calleth these his *principal* motiues: if the principal bee so weake in mouing, it followveth that he hath noe motiues to good life at al. And thus much I was moued to answvere to his motiues. As for his *Antitheses* vvhich followv, and vvhich he maketh betvvixt his consortes and Papists: as, that, *they followv Gods vvord vvhich is a lantern to our feet, Papists followv obscure traditions: they ground their doctrine on Apostles and Prophets, Papists followv the decretales of most vvicked and*

Aboue booke 3. chap. 7.

impure Popes &c. I am little moued to answer them, none of them being worthy any answer, and such as they bee, being answered already abouein more proper places. After all this, as though he had gotten the victorie, the Triumphe followeth in these words: *Reasons discourse therfore concerning Vertues, which are so rare among the Papists; and of vices, that so warm among st them, but vnreasonably insisted in his Survey.* But these are but your words Sir, what answer you to my first chapter? He answereth that *Caluin doth not deny that men ought to do well for hope of reward: nor doth Luther mislike that man should feare Hel: most falsely and without al colour doth he charge vs with taking away all feare of Iudgement.* But I hauing shewed that they say so, by their words, and hauing proued that they must also say so, by their doctrine: this is no answer but a bare, yet a vvonted denyal, and so I may conclude as I did, that the reformers hauing taken away Hope and feare, hedge vp the way to vertue, and breake open the gate to to all vice and villanie, and so make heauen a place inaccessible, and Hel our common home.

## The Somme of the second chapter.

*Simon Magus, Eunomius, and other ancient heretikes affirmed that only faith iustifieth: and although scriptures alleaged affirm that only faith nether iustifieth nor suffiseth, it standing often tymes vvith euil life: yet Luther, Caluin, and others, haue also imbraced this opinion. But hence is inferred, that the gappe is layed open to al maner of vice. because it saith only, by apprehending Christes iustice to bee ours, doth iustifie: then is the sinner by it not only iustified from al former euil life, but also, if he hold this faith (as Caluin sayth if it be once had it can not be lost) vvhat soeuer sinne he committeth, he shal still remain iust euen in the verie acte and exercise of sinne. and so holding fast by this faith, he need not care for sinne, because if no sinne but incredulitie, cã deprive him of faith (as it is proued that al other sinnes stand vvith faith) then can it not deprive him of iustice, and so can do him no hurt.*

Luth. ser. in Sic Deus dilexit. & in cap. 2. Gal. lib. de libert. Chri. Calu. li. 3. cap. 13. §. 11. cap. 17. & cap. 18. §. 8.

*Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

1. SOteliff to shevv him selfe a faithfull Scholler to his Maisters, admitteth that only faith iustifieth, and proueth it also by these vvordes of S. *Paule* Rom. 3. *Vvee*

account (Sotc. saith conclude) *a man to be iustified vvithout the vvorkes of the lavve*: but I had answered, that S. *Paule* excludeth not vvorkes, vvhich proceed of faith and grace, but only ether the vvorkes and ceremonies of the lavv of *Moyses*, or of the lavv of nature, vvhich proceed not from faith in Christe: vvhich is also the exposition of S. *Ambrose*, S. *Hierom*, S. *Augustin* and S. *Thomas* of *Aquas* and others: and yet *Sot.* saith nothing to this. For although vvorkes that go before faith, do not iustifie, and though vvorkes following faith and going before iustifying grace, do only dispose to iustification, yet vvorkes vvhich follovv iustification, do iustifie and increase iustification, vvhich diuines calle a second iustification. But if faith only iustifie, vvhat sayth *Sotcl:* to my argument & collation? he sayth that though faith only iustifieth, yet not vvithout good vvorkes, because it can not be separated from them. But I hauing proued by scriptures that they may be separated, vvhat answere he to that nothing. I will adde therfore reason, by vvhich I vvill proue that faith may be separated from good vvorkes, yea may be ioyned vvith euil. for first *Luther* and *Calu* teach that al our vvorkes are sinnes, as about

Ambr. in hunc locum. Hieron. ep. ad Ctesiphōt Aug. li. de fide & op. cap. 14. & de Spiritu & lit. c. 6. & li. 14. de bon. de grat. & li. de cath cap 7. Tho. 1. 2. q. 113. a. 3. Rom. Apoc. 22.

Luther in assert. art. 36 & one opus peccatum est. Cal. l. 3. c. 1. & l. 4. 11. § 7. & c. 14.

I haue proued by their expresse wordes, and therfore *Sotcliff* is retourned to his old impudencie, vvhen he saith pag. 89. lin. 18. *they neuer vvrote nor thought soe:* but saith consisteth vvith some vvorkes, *ergo* vvith sinnes. Secondlie, as before, so again I vrge *Sotcliff* thus: vvhen he him selfe is indevved vvith the liuelieſt and moſt quickning faith that euer he had, I demaund whether he can sinne or noe? If he say noe, he speaketh against experience, and against scriptur vvhich exhorteth and commaundeth euen the faithfull, not to sinne, vvhich were fooliſh if they could not sinne. If he say hee can sinne, then I demaund vvhether this sinne expelleth faith or cōsisteth vvith it. he can not say that it expelles faith, for then by euerie sinne he ſhould become a faithles infidel. Vvherfore he muſt say that his sinne consisteth with faith, and consequentlie vvith iuſtification, faith only iuſtifying, and ſo faith ſhall iuſtifie not only *vvithout the concurrence of good vvorkes* as *Sotcliff* confeſſeth *pag.* 83. *lin.* 32. but alſo euen in the preſence of euil workes. And ſo it follovveth that if faith only iuſtifie, a faithfull man need not to care for sinnes, ſo he haue care to hold his faith and to beleeue that Chriſtes iuſtice is his: bicauſe

no sinne but infidelitie bereaues him of his faith, and consequentlie can not hurt him faith still making him iust; and so the gap is layed open to all the faithfull, whoe if they hold faith (as *Caluin* saith they can not but hold it) may sinne freelie, and yet remain iust, and receaue no harme by sinning.

supra.

2. But because our minister findes him selfe troubled in answering, he accuseth me of great iniurie as a false reporter of *Luther*: *Iniuries* (saith he) *this sycophant doth most vniustlie inuent and misreport Luthers words, for in his commentaries in Gal. 2. he hath not the wordes alleaged by Kellison, albeit he holdeth affirmatiue.* Hath he not Sir? Surelie if you haue read that place either you haue ill eyes, or else you are strangelie impudent. I will not deny but that sometymes *Luther* saith good workes are necessarie and can not be separated from true faith, but yet (as it is his and Caluins propertie to contradict them selues) he hath y^t^ wordes I charged him with all, and if he haue not, not only I but Bellarmin also and diuers others haue calumniated this man of God. The wordes wherewith I charged Luther were these: *sola fides necessaria est vt iustè simus, cetera omnia liberrima, neque præcepta amplius neque prohibita: only faith is ne-*

Luth. in 1. Pet. 1.

*cessarie to make vertuous, if others things be not forbidden, nor commanded any more nor forbidden.*

And there, by your leaue Sir minister, *Luther* hath, in cap. 2. Gal. and vvith the same *Bellarmine* also chargeth him. But because *Sotel.* saith, *Luther* meaneth not, that hauing faith, vvee may do vvhat vvee vvill, but only (o vvretched and vvrested glosse) that if vvee haue true faith, *vvee are stirred to doe vvel of free choice*; besides that in this place *Luther* saith, *that nothing is any more commanded or prohibited*, in the same place he saith flatlie, that vvorkes are not necessarie: *quando sic docetur fides iustificat, sed simul oportet seruare mandata Dei, quia scriptum est, si vis ad vitam ingredi serua mandata: ibi Christus negatus est & fides abolita*: *vvhen it is so taught, only faith iustifieth, but withal it behoueth to keep the commaundements, because it is vvritten, if thou wilt enter to life keep the commaundements, there Christ is denyed, and faith is abolished.* And in another place, he pronounceth in this manner. *Opus non potest docere nisi ledas fidem, cum fides & opera in re iustificationis, extreme aduersentur, ita sit vt doctrina operum necessario sit doctrina dæmonium.* vvhich vvordes are thus Inglished: *The vvorke can not be taught vnles thou hurt faith, seing that faith and vvorkes do extremlie repugn, so it comes*

Bel. to. 4. de Iustif. cap. 1.

Luth. libr. de votis mon.

to passe, that the doctrin of vvorkes, is the doctrin of deuilles. Yea, saith *Luther*, (and these vvordes can haue noe fauorable glosse) *bona opera non faciunt bonum virum nec mala malum &c.* that is: *good vvorkes make not a good man, nor euil vvorkes an euil man &c. as no good vvorke profiteth an infidel to saluation and iustice, so contrariwise, no euil vvorke maketh an euil and damned man, but only incredulitie.* And yet again: *vides quam diues sit homo Christianus &c.* thou *seest how rich a Christian man or one that is baptised, is: that though he vvould, he can not loose saluation, by how grieuous soeuer great sinnes, vnles he vvil not beleeue. for no sinnes can damne him but only incredulitie.* Soe that *Luther* graunteth that vvhich I inferred out of their doctrine, of their *Solafidian iustice*, to vvit, that if a man hold faith, though he may sinne, yet no sinne can hurt him, he being still iust by faith: and so he hath free libertie to sinne. *Caluin* iumpeth vvith *Luther* in the same, for he reprehendeth *Petrus Lombardus* the *Master* of the *sentences*, for saying, that it is presumption to hope for heauen vvithout merites: *but vvee* (sayth *Caluin*) *vvhen vvee see that sinners are commaunded to conceiue hope of saluation, let vs vvillingly presume so much of goddes vertue that trusting only to his mercie, and casting avvay*

Luth. lib. de libert. Christia. na.

li. de capt. Babil. cap. de baptis. mo.

Caluin lib. 3. inst. c. 2. §. vlt.

*al confidence in vvorkes, vvee ought vvell to hope.* And so my conclusion followeth again, to wit, that if faith only iustifie, nether good vvorkes can help vs, nor euil vvorkes hurte vs: and so if vvee beleeue, vvee need not feare any sinne, but may aduentur vppon it boldlie, vnles this doctrin be false, that thus imboldeneth vs, as certes it can not bee true nor of God, which so fauoureth vice, which is so displeasing to God.

## The somme of the third chapter.

*LVther and Caluin affirme that euerie man is, and ought to be assured of his saluation, and Caluin addeth that faith not only assureth a man of præsent, but also of future iustice and perseueraunce, vvhich opinion notvvithstanding is disproued by euident scriptures and reasons: The last reason is this, because if a man be assured that he is iuste and shall remain iuste, he needes not feare any sinne, because then no sinne but infidelitie, can despoile him of iustice. And so euen in the eele of sinne, he may discourse thus, I am told by Caluin that I must certainlie beleeue that by Christes iustice and promise (vvhich he teacheth not to be dependent of good vvorkes) I am iuste and shal remain iuste, and that so beleeuing, I can not but bee iuste: I need not feare*

Luther. in cap. 2. ad Gal. Calu. l. 3. Iust. c. 2. §. 7 §. 26. 29. & lib. 3. c. 2. §. 40.

Cal. lib. 3. Iust. ca. 2. §. vlt.

then this acte of sinne, vvhose pleasure or temporal profit tempteth me. for I vvould fully beleeue that I vvere iust by Christes iustice, vvith beleeuing so (vvith Luther and Caluin lye) I shalbe soe, and vvhosoeuer beleeueth sinne can not hurt me.

Sotcliffes answer vvherin the Reply is hid.

Luth. in com. Gal. Cal supra.

VVhereas I sayd that Luther say the Credeum tibi fore saluum & misericordiam & ita erit sine dubio, beleeue that Christe vvill bee thy saluation, & it shall so turne to thee: Thalbe soe: and that Caluin defineth faith to bean assurance of our saluation and gods fauour. Sotcliff admitteth it, and proueth it as wisely, that is thus: the Apostle, saith he, is sure that nothing can separate him from the loue of God, and vvee beleeue in our Creed remission of sinnes. But S. Paule ether ascertaineth him selfe not of his own loue to Christ, but only of Christes loue & fauour & assurance to his elect, or else he assureth him selfe by a particuler reuelation of his own grace, loue, and perseuerance, vvhich Sotcliff neuer had, or else he speaketh in the name of the elect vvho haue a great trust and hope and moral certitude: vvhich the Greeke vvord πεποιθησις signifieth: and therfore S. Ambrose vppon this place, teacheth

Ro. 8. Vasquez. Disput. 106. in 2. 4. Hae. 2. 5.

confido, I trust. And as for the article of remission of sinnes, by which they would proue that euery one in particuler is assured by that only we beleeue, that there is remission of sinnes in the Church, but not that our sinnes in particuler are forgiuen (for in what place of Scripture findeth hee that?) not that all Christians sinnes are forgiuen, for then there should be no Christians reprobate. Or if because in general remission of sinnes is promised to them that are sorie for them by a true sorrow, our self not sure of this sorrow will inferre, that his sinnes are forgiuen in particuler: then because heauen is promised to all that keep the commaundements, he may assure himselfe and that in particuler is one of the elect, who yet is not sure that he keepeth the commaundements, yea sure that he neuer doth, nether can, they being in the opinion of *Luther* and *Caluin* impossible: but this falsehood I haue sufficiently refuted aboue fol. 319. yet if some graunt this assurednes of our saluation and iustification, I demaund whether hee be assured of dependently of his owne workes, and dependently only of Christes workes, or dependently also of his owne workes. If dependently only of Mat. 19.

Christes vvorkes, then liue howv he vvill, he is sure to be saued, and so needes not to feare any sinne whatsoeuer. If dependent he also on his own vvorkes, then as he is sure of his saluation, so hee is sure he shall neuer sinne, of vvhich his assuraunce the Doctours doubt, and al they also that knovv his accustomed behauiour: or if he bee not sure of that, then cā he not be sure of his Saluation, it depending of that. But let thē bee assured of their present and future iustice and Saluation, and remission of sinnes: then my conclusion vvhich I haue hence deduced, must go for true, to vvit, that holding this faith that vvee are iuste and electe, vvee may do vvhat vvee vvill, bicause that faith vvill all iustifie vs.

## The Somme of the fourth chapter.

Luth. ser. super Sic Deus dilexit mund. Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 14. § 9. 10. 11. 19. & c. 18. § 9. cap. 19. § 2. 4. 5. l. 3. Inst. cap. 4. § 25. 26. 27.

THis Chapter shevveth howv Luther and Caluin are of opinion that though all our actions are sinnes, yet noe sinne is imputed to a faithfull man: vvhence is inferred, that a faithfull man is to feare noe sinne, bicause noe sinne can be imputed vnto him, so long as he holdeth fast by faith.

*Sotcliffes Answer with the Refutation.*

HE telles me first in plain termes, that *it is a playne lie, to say that Caluin saith all iust and faithfull mennes vvorkes are sinnes.* But if *Caluin* say so, then to you Sir Minister the lye redoundeth, from whom it proceedeth. Speake then *Caluin* and harken *Sotcliff*. *Primum dico* (sayth *Caluin*, speaking of iust men) *quod optimum ab illis proferri potest, aliqua tamen carnis impuritate respersum & corruptum esse.* first I say the best (vvorks) that can be brought forth of them, yet it is sprinckled, and corrupted vvith some impuritie of the flesh. And a litle after he sayth, *nec vnum a Sanctis exire opus, quod si in se censeatur, non mereatur instam opprobrij mercedem*, not any one vvorke proceedeth from the saintes, which, if it bee censured in it selfe, doth not deserue a iust reward of opprobrie. And again lib. 3. c. 14. §. 11. *vve must sticke vppon these 2. thinges first that there vvas neuer vvorke of a faithfull man, vvhich was not damnable &c.* And Luther also saith, *omne opus bonum peractum est, nisi ignoscat Deus misericordia, cuius good vvorke is a sinne vnlesse Gods mercie pardon it.* Speake nowe Sir *Sotcliff*, tel troth, and shame the deuil, vvhoe nowe hath told the *plain lye*? Caluin. l. 3. Inst. c. 14. §. 9. in confut. tract. Latom.

As touching the other accusation, to vvit

that they say, *that no sinne can be imputed to a faithfull man*, Sotcliff sayth that they meane only, that former sinnes are not imputed to a faithfull man. But first if this were true that they only meant soe, yet were this a sufficient Antecedence for mee to deduce my former consequence. for if after al my sinnes nothing be required but this easie penaunce, to beleeue that Christe is my iustice, or hath forgiuen my sinnes; who will feare to do that, which so easilie is vndone? yea if faith make former sinnes not to bee imputed, why hath it not the vertue while lest it remaineth, to make that present and future sinnes also should not bee imputed? especiallie it remaining with præsent and actual sinnes, and remaining, makes vs iust, or reputed as iust. Secondly *Luther* and *Calvin* speake absolutlie of al sinnes. *Luther* saith, *vbi fides est nullum peccatum nocere potest: Where faith is no sinne can hurt*: but faith is in him that cõmitteth fornication, and while lest he cõmitteth it; else euerie fornicatour & sinner should be an infidel, *ergo* that sinne can not hurt a faithful man. *Calvin* also sayth that our consciences by faith apprehending Christes iustice are adorned; and that *by the puritie of Christes iustice the blots*

Luther. Ser. super hæc Deus dilexit.

Calu. libr. 3. Inst. c. 14. §. 12.

and filthes of our imperfections, are hidden, and are not imputed vnto vs. &c. And again saith he: *non illic queritur quomodo iusti simus, sed quomodo iniusti licet ac indigni, pro iustis habeamur:* Calu. libr. 3. cap. 19. §. 2. here the question is not, how vvee are iuste, but how being vniuste and vnworthie, wee be esteemed as iuste. and this he saith in the same place, wee can not looke for by fullfilling the law, that being impossible, but by faith in Christe. So that he that beleeueth that Christes iustice is his, is reputed as iust though he bee not. I argue the as before I haue done: ether a faithfull man by sinning looseth faith or not? *Sotc.* can not say he looseth it: for then euery sinner should bee an infidel. If *Sotc.* say he looseth it not: then he sinning still remaineth iust, or is stil reputed as iust, bicause faith alone iustifieth vvithout al concurrence of vvorkes: and so holding faith he needeth not to feare any sinne, bicause faith makes it not to be imputed, in that it makes the sinner still reputed iust, and as iust as before.

## The somme of the fifte chapter.

THE *Reformers Luther, and Caluin, and others* teache, that our actions euen the best &

of the best men, are sinnes: but this their opinion I disproue by Scriptures and pregnaunt reasons: and then out of this principle and ground of theirs, I frame this argument. Seing wee must needes do something and can not be altogether idle, if al wee doe is sinne, in vain do wee put a difference betwixt our actions, and so may as well aduentur vppon thefies, as almes deeds.

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

1. THe Minister perceiuing that this conclusion followeth euidently out of the aforsayd premisses, verie wisely, but yet also verie boldly, denyeth the premisses: and he sayth he hath declared that this my accusation *is a mortal or rather Capital slander*. But howe I haue conuinced this doctrine to be theirs, and howe *Sotcliff* with al his glossing could not cleare them, let the former chapter, yea their plain wordes beare witnes. Or if *Sotc.* alleage, that these wordes escaped them vnaduisedlie, I will here quote him diuers other places, by which he shal see their constant opinion in this matter. Luther in his *confutation of Latomus his reason*, sayth, *saint Paule* (who yet once was iuste) *neuer did good worke in his life, and that*

the best he euer did, vvas of it selfe a sinne: and so his preaching and peregrination to saue soules, yea his martyrdom, vvere damnable sinnes. and as I had alleaged, in another place he sayth, that *all the moral vertues and scholastique sciences are sinnes and errours.* Caluin besides the places alleaged, hath these vvordes: *Hinc facile cernimus esse maledictum, nec modo nullius ad iustitiam pretij, sed & rei in damnationem meriti, quicquid coritat &c. Hence vvee easilie see that vvhat so euer man think to, meditateth accomplisheth, before he be reconciled to God by faith, is cursed.* &c. the same is his expresse opinion of the vvorkes of the iust and faithfull in the same chapter, as aboue I haue related. and in the next chapter he saith, *that from the most perfect man in the vvorld, nothing procedeth which is not cotaminated vvith some blot or filth of sinne.* And that this is his opinion, the verie title, of the third chapter of his seconnd booke vvil testifie: for the title is this: *Ex corrupta hominis natura nihil nisi damnabile prodire:* vvhich in Inglish is this: *That from the corrupt natur of man, nothing but damnable doth proceed.* And so my præmises being verified out of Luther and Caluin, to wit, that they teach that al the vvorkes not only of the vvicked but also of the iuste are sinnes, my

Luther in propos. fit. Collectis & damnatis a pers. censibus.

Cal libr. 3. Inst. cap. 14. § 4.

libr. 3 cap. 14. § 9. 10. 11. & c. 15. § 3.

conclusion thence drawyn, followeth euidently, to wit, that seing we must needes be doing some thing, if whatsoeuer we do bee sinne, then is it vain to put any difference betwixt our actions, or to make scruple of some actions, seing all are sinne: and so we may as well aduenture vppon theftes as almesdeedes, and sinnes as vertuous actions.

2. But *Sot.* saith that I charge them also of saying, *that the faithful mans euil deedes are good and honest.* I do not (Sir *Sotcliff*) charge them soe. only I say, that *they account the faithful mannes euil deedes as good and honest, or at least as such that are not reputed euil but rather good.* And you knowe that a disiunctiue proposition is true, if one parte be true. Nowe that they teach that euil workes are counted good in the iust, I haue already shewed, in that I haue shewed, in the former chapter, that they teach, that the iust mannes sinnes are not imputed as sinnes, and haue conuinced also in that and this chapter, that they hold the iust mannes best workes to bee damnable sinnes: though as Caluin sayth, *they please God because he supporteth them:* and so that curse pronounced against them that *call good euil, and euil good*, must needes light

Caluin li. 3. cap. 18. 5.

Isa. 5.

vppon them, yea and vppon our *Deane* also, vvho though he finde faule vvith this do-ctrin, and vvould cleare *Luther* and *Calvin* from it; yet in the same place *pag. 89. lin. 1.* he sayth, *that they commend Gods mercie that imputeth not mennes sinnes, albeit they be verie great and heynous.*

3. He hath obserued likewise that I affirm that *Calvin* teacheth, *that original sinne hath blotted out th' Image of God in man.* I affirme it in deed: and dare you deny it? Calvin (saith *Sotcliff*) only saith that the Image of God is not lost, but only blemished. but looke a-gain in his latin Institutions lib. 2. cap. 1. §. 5. and you shal see that he sayth, that by sinne the Image of God is *obliterata in Adamo*, that is obliterated, scraped out, abolished, as Tho-mas Thomasius vvil teach this old Gram-mariã. Certes man is sayd to beare the Ima-ge of God in that he is lord of his actions as God is, resonable as hee, immortal as hee, inclined to good and vertue as hee: but *Lu-ther* and *Calvin* say that vvee haue lost free-vvill, as vvee haue seen and shal see again in the next chapter. they saye mannes natur is so corrupt that (as *Calvin* telleth vs) *a man can neither imagin nor conceue, nor comprehend any thing else but vvickednes, iniquitie, and cor-*

Thom. Thomas lib. li. v. ob-stero.

Calu. li. 2. Inst. ca. 5. in fine. lib. 3. cap. 14. § 5.

*ruption*: yea (saith hee) *according to that vvee are by natur, you may draw sooner oyle out of a stone, then one good vvorke from vs.* vvhich if it bee true I demaund, vvhat signe here is of a free and reasonable natur? and whether there be not greater resemblaunce of a beastlike and brutish natur, rather then of a natur in which is engraven the Image of God? Adde to this that *Luther* sayth the soule of man is *ex traduce* and mortal, and therfore reckeneth *the immortalitie of the soule, amongst the monstrous opinions* (as he calleth them,) *of the Pope*: and the let *Sotcliff* tell mee, vvhat Image of God is in man, more then in a beast: and seing that *Luther* saith al our sciences are errours and al our moral vertues vices, how is ma *animal rationale* more then a beast, seing he is onlie prone to concupiscence, not bent at al to vertue, brutishly ignoraunte, indevved vvith no science or knovvledge?

Luth. disput. Theol. vvittemberg. habita an. 1545. thes. 31. & in assert. artic. 36 cone 10 damnatorum. ar 27 idem 2 sub finem.

4. Lastlie hee hath espied another calumnie in mee as true as the former, in that forsooth I say, that *Calvin* affirmeth al the vvorkes of infidelles to bee sinnes. And doth he not say soe? haue not I novv, and had I not before alleaged his ovvn vvordes? *Sotcliff* answereth that Calvin saith not, *that all their actions are sinnes but that they sinned al in their*

Calu. lib. 3. Inst cap. 14. § 4.

moral actions: but if Sorcliff by moral actions vnderstand al moral actions, he shal as hardlie distinguish these two speeches, as him selfe from Sorc. if he meane, that Calain sayth only that infidels sinne in some of their moral actions but not in al: he contradicteth Caluin; who, as wee haue seen, sayth that whatsoeuer an infidel thinketh or doeth, is sinne, yea that you shal as soone distil oyle out of a stone, as one good worke from our naked natur: yea that whatsoeuer worke proceedeth from the iuste man, is sinne, and contaminated by our corrupted flesh and natur. And so the præmises of my Syllogism and argumẽt being proued out of *Luther* & *Caluin*, the aforesayd cõclusion, to wit, that if al our actions be sinnes, wee may as wel adiuentur on theftes and murders, as on those workes which are called good, still firmlie standeth: and this conclusion standing, that doctrine falleth, or standeth disgraced, and discarded.

## The somme of the sixt chapter.

THe Stoickes and ancient heretikes denyed freewill: so do the late heretikes of this age *Luther, Melanchthon, and Caluin*. this heresie is di- Luth. l. de ser. arb. Calui. li. 1. Inst. c. 15. § 8. l. 2. c. 2. l. 3. c. 13.

sprouted, by plain Scriptures, euident reason, and palpable experience, vvhich none but a Sote. can deny. Amongst other reasons, this is the last: If vve haue no freevvill to abstain from sinne but do necessarilie sinne, if it be not in our powver to resist the stirres insurrections, and to vvithstand the deuilles tentations, or y^e vvorldes allurementes: then is not man to deliberate, whether he shal sinne or noe, but hee must by and by yeald to necessitie and lay downe al armes and weapons of resistaunce; and yeelding he can not be blamed, because there can bee no better excuse, then necessitie. And so the gap by this doctrine is broken open, the deuil, the flesh, the world, and al sinne may enter, vvithout al resistaunce.

Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.

SOtcliff denyeth that they deny freevvill: and yet in this his denial, his tongue so faultereth, that it is hard to deuine, vvhat he vvould say. first (saith he) vvee do not deny freevvill in al thinges, as did the Manichees, vvho hold that sinne proceeded not from our vvill, but from the substaunce of the euil soule. Vvhat the Manichees opinion vvas I do not here examin, nether do I stand vppon the ground on vvhich they and you denye freevvill, but vvhether you deny it or noe: al-

though euen in that ground you disaggree not much, you making also the soule of man a brutish and euil natur, vvhich can euaporate nothing but the poisonful ayre and filthy matter of sinne, as wee haue seen in the former chapter. Secondlie (saith *Sotc.*) *neither did Luther deny freevvil simplie, but only in thinges that concern th'attaining of the Kingdom of heauen.* And did not I confesse expresselie, that though *Luther* and *Melancthon*, at first denyed freewill simply, yet after vvard they graunted it in ciuil and externe operations? But at least my argument proueth that if *in actions vvhich concern the attaining of heauen*, vvee haue no freevvill, vvee are not to deliberate anxiouslie, vvhat vvee do or do not in that kinde, but in buying and selling and such like. And seing that they say also that Gods prescience and prædestination imposeth a seruile necessitie on al our actions, it followeth that in these thinges also, vvee haue no free vvill and choise. *Melancthon*, as *Ruard Tapper* relateth, sayth that vve haue no free vvill in our invvard actions and affections, bicause sayth he, noe man can moderate them: and, (sayth *Melancthon*) *Si ad prædestinationem quis referat humanam voluntatem, nec in externis nec in internis* Ruard. a. 7.

*operibus vllà est libertas: If we referre nothing will to Gods prædestination, neither in intern, nor extern vvorkes, is there any libertie.* Luther also, as our learned Bishop of Rochester, called Bishop Fisher, relateth, layth, *nobis ad infima spectantibus res apparent arbitrariæ & fortuitæ, sed ad superna spectantibus omnia sunt necessaria.* To vs that looke downe to thinges inferiour, thinges seeme free and contingent, but if vvee looke vp to thinges above, that is to Gods foresight, decree, & prædestinatiõ) *al thinges are necessarie.* And so in vain is al deliberation and consultation, bicause, vvhatsoeuer vvee deliberate, that shal fall out necessarilie, which God hath forseen and præordained. but let Sotc. goe on. *Furthermore* (layth hee) *neither doth Luther teach that free vvill goeth necessarilie out vvay, vvhether the Spirit spurreth it, or the deuil vrgeth it.* But let Sotc. read Luther boke *de seruo arbitrio*, & then let him tel mee whether he hath not abused both Luther and mee, and if he vvere not beetle blind, he might see that this followeth also of Luthers doctrin.

Rosseus. 21.36.

2. Then Sotcliff coming to Calain, thus pronounceth *nor doth Calain affirm, that Gods prouidence and prædestination take away free vvill, as he desperatlie and imprudentlie cha-*

him. This you not onlie *imprudentlie*, but as you are vvonted, impudentlie also deny. for the places by mee alleaged out of *Calum*, do conuince the contrarie: and I haue shewed aboue in the secõd chapter of the first booke, that *Calum* maketh Gods will and decree or ordonnaunce, *a necessitie of thinges*, and addeth vvithal, that God so moueth our vvill to sinne that it can not chuse but sinne. let *Sotcliff* reade the title only of the second chapter of the second booke of *Calums Institutions*, vvhich is this, *hominem arbitrij libertate nunc esse spoliatum & miserae seruituti addictum: that man is now vvdespoiled of the libertie of free vvill and addicted to miserable seruitude*: and he shal see by that Title, and by the chapter it selfe, how plainlie *Calum* deny eth free will. Certes *Calum* in the 6. and the 7. section of the same chapter, and the fift section of the next chapter, endeuoureth to proue, that though man sinne willinglie, yet not freely and so hath a vvill, but not a free will, bicause free onlie from coaction or constraint, but not from necessitie.

Calu. l. 2. Inst. ca 23. l. 3. cap 2. l. 3. c. 21. & cap. 23. §. 6. & 7.

Cal. lib. 3. Inst. c. 23. §. 8. & 9. & 12. Inst ca 3. §. 5.

3. Vvhere the Reader must note the difference vvhich deuines and Philophers put betvvixt, *naturale, spontaneum, voluntarium* and *liberum*. for the stone descendeth naturallie

A distinction markable.

Arist. lib. 3. eth. cap. 2. Nisse. lib. 5. Philoseph. ca. 23 Damasc. lib. 2. de fide ca. 24. Tho. 1. 2. q. 6. a. 2.

ascendeth by violence: the brute beaste eateth & drinketh *Spontaneè*, that is of his own prone inclination, and is drawn from his prouendor constrainedlie: the blessed in heauen loue God *voluntarie*, voluntarilie not by compulsion, and yet necessarilie, it being not in the vvilles powver, to contein or suspend her affection, vvhen *summum bonum* is proposed to her by cleare vision, and so they loue God vvith a vvil, but not vvith a free vvil: That is *liberum*, *free*, and done vvith a free vvill, vvhich is in our powver to do or not doe. *Caluin* therfore graunteth that wee sinne and do vvorkes of vertue vvillingly not freelie, vvith a vvil, but not vvith a free vvill, not constrainedlie, but yet necessarilie. So that *Caluin* graunteth vs no more electiō and free choice in our actions, then brute beastes haue, only they do thinges by natural inclination, vvee by our vvill, but as necessarilie as they. And therfore saith *Caluin* if you vnderstand by freevvill, a vvill in doing ill or vvell, free from constraint, I admitte the word: but because by this vvord, *freewill*, is ordinarilie vnderstood a vvill free, not only from constraint, but also from necessitie, vvhich hath in the ovvn free choise to do vvel or euil: therfore (saith hee) I

vvhat free vvil Caluin graunteth.

*vvould not vse this vvord, & alios si me consulent, absti-* l.2. cap. 2. §.8. infine.
*nere optarim: and I vvould vvish others to abstein from the vse of it, if they should aske my Counsel.* And therfore according to this in the next chapter §. 5. *bicause therfore our vvill is deteined and holden vvith a seruitude of sinning, it can not moue it selfe to good, nor apply it selfe:* and a litle after: *perro quod voluntatem dico necessitate in malum vel trahi vel duci, mirum est si cui videatur aspera locutio:* now that I sayd *the vvill by necessitie is drawn or ledd to euil, it is, mervail, if this speach to any man, seeme hurde.* And in the 5. *chapter* of the same second booke *Caluin* answereth to obiections made for freevvil: and answering to the first and second obiection, which imported this: that if man haue not free vvill he can not sinne, bicause he can not be blamed for that vvhich is not in his free choise, nor yet be iustlie punished for that vvhich proceeded not from his free election: he answereth, that though vvee sinne not vvith a freevvill yet bicause vvee sinne vvith a vvill, and voluntarilie, though not freelie, vvee are iustly blamed and punished. So that it is more then euident that *Caluin* graunteth only a vvill but denyeth free will, and as euident that *Sotcliff* is ignoraunt or impudent in de- cap. 3. §. 5. cap. 3. §. 2. a.

nying that he denyeth it.

4. This done Sotcliff acknowledgeth that I endeuour to proue freewill, as in deed I haue not only endeuoured it, but haue brought it to passe, though Sotc. not so much as indeuoureth, to answer my arguments: only he sayth that against the *natural man* (of whom aboue wee haue spoken) *Kellison marshalleth al his forces*, but sayth *he if by freewill he vnderstand only an abilitie and vvill to do vvickedlie, then vve deny not but man hath freevvill.* I vnderstand, Sir Marishal, a vvill vvhich hath not only a povver and abilitie to doe, for that brute beastes haue, and Caluin graunteth vve sinne by vvill, but vvhich hath povver vvith freedom, choise, indifference, to do vvell at least holpen by Gods grace, and to do euill of it selfe; and this freevvill, *Luther* and *Caluin*, and *Melanct hon* deny, and you al, follow them in this vvheras Sot. addeth, that vvee haue no freevvil *in Spiritual matters and concerning life euer lasting*, hee contradicteth Scriptures flatlie, vvhich foolishly should exhort and commaund vs to *conuert our selues*, to do *penaunce*, to *loue God*, and to *keep the commaundements*, (al vvhich thinges concern life euarlasting) if it vvere not in our povver and free choise vvith Gods

about.

Psech. 18. & 31. Ita 30. Zacha 1. Matth. 3. 11. 19. 21.

graces to fulfill these commandements and exhortations: for vvho vvill commaund or exhort any to that, vvhich is not in his free choise? And also in these things vvee are not to consult or deliberate, bicause they are nether in the free electio, of the natural man (to vse *Sorcliffes* vvord) nor of the man healed by grace or directed by Gods spirit grace (as as they say) doing al vvithout our free cooperation. Hauing then convinced, that *Luther*, *Caluin*, *Melanchthon*, and cõmonlie al the reformers do deny free vvill euen to sinne, and must deny it also vvith *Caluin*, if they vvill speake consequentlie to their principles of Gods præscience, prædestination, vvill, and decree: I may vvith good leaue and safe conscience, inferr my former conclusion, to vvit, that then euerie man is to yeeld to the allurementes of the vvorld, importunities of the deuil, and suggestions of the flesh, bicause it is not in his free choise to resist, nether can he be blamed for any sinne, but rather is to be excused by necessitie, vvhich vvill alvvayes yeeld him this reasonable excuse, *I could do no other vvise*: yea vvhen the occasion to sinne commeth, he is not to deliberate vvhether he shall yeeld or noe, but must presentlie yeeld,

knowing, that he hath noe libertie to doe otherwise. And so the gap is layed open to al vice & villanie, which may rush in bluntly, without al resistaunce.

## The Somme of the seuenth chapter.

Luth. l. de seruo arb. Calu. l. 2. Inst. cap. 7. §. 5. & in Harm. Mat. 19 & l. 3 Inst. c. 19. §. 4.

THis chapter supposing that Luther, Caluin, and others do hold, the cõmaundements to bee impossible, doth thence inferre that then the gap also is opened to al Vice: for if a man be once perswaded that he can not keep the commaundements, he must also perswade him selfe, that he can not auoyd any sinne, noe sinne being to be found, which is not against Gods commaundement: and so he will haue as much courage to fulfill the commaundement, or to auoyd sinne, as to fly vp to heauen; this being as impossible as that: and if he should go about it, he should thereby go about to make Luther and Caluin lyers, who haue taught that it is an impossible attempt: and so he must yeeld him selfe a bandman to al sinne, and endeauor to keep no commaundement.

### Sotcliffes answer vnto the Refutation.

SOtcliff answereth, as he did aboue to the third chapter of the sixe booke: to wit, that they doe not hold that the lawe

*is simplie in it selfe impossible to the regenerate ma.* But I haning in that place shewed, that they al hold the lavve to be impossible euen to the regenerate, at least in respect of that perfection which it also commaundeth: my aforesayd conclusion stil followeth, and can not be hindred by this answer. yea *Sot.* cõfirmeth my accusation of *Luther* and *Calvin*, for he endeuoureth to proue out of scriptures, and Fathers, yea S: *Thomas* of *Aquin*, that the law is impossible: which yet in deed his alleaged places proue not. For S. *Peter* only saith that nether the disciples nor their for-Fathers could beare the yoke, not of the *Decalogue*, but of the *ceremonial lavv*, by reason of the multitude of præcepts: not that they could not at al beare it, (for al lavves if they be reasonable commaunde only thinges possible, and may be kept at least vvith Gods grace) but bicause they could hardlie bee kept, and by force of the lavv it selfe, could not at al be kept, bicause that law gaue noe grace; and so that lavv being figuratiue, vvas to be abrogated, at the entraunce of the lavv of grace, vvhich is the verine of that figure. Vvherfore S. *Peter* addeth, *but by the grace of our lord Iesus Christ wee beleeue to bee saued in like manner as they also*, by

about booke 3. chap. 4.

Act. 15.

vvhich vvordes he signifieth, that the Fathers of ye old testamẽt were many of them saued by faith in Christe, and grace receaued for the merites of Christe to come, and cõsequentlie, by grace they also fulfilled the lavv, else they could not haue been saued, bicause maledictiõ vvas pronounced against the transgressors, In vvhich sense S. *Paule* sayd *factores legis iustificabuntur, the doers of the lavv shalbe iustified.*

Rom. 7. & 8.

2. *Sanct Paule* is as foolishelie alleaged for hee speaketh of the lavv of concupiscence, vvhich he also calleth *the lavv of membres*, vvhich as S. *Thomas* sayth, is called a lavv, in

1. 2. q. 91. a. 6.

that sense, as the natural inclination in brute beastes is called the lavv and instinct of natur, and this lavv S. *Paule* confesseth to be contrarie to the lavv of the mynd, that is the lavv of ye *Decalogue*, or of reason, or of faith, bicause it inclineth to cupiditie and concupiscence of thinges forbidden by the lavv: and in respect of this, he sayth, that he is *carnal sold vnder sinne*, bicause subiect to concupiscence, vvhich he calleth sinne, in that it inciteth to sinne and proceedeth of original sinne, and although al men vvith Gods grace may deny consent to the motions of the flesh and cõcupiscence, (vvhich

only is commaunded, yet none in this life, but Christe and his B. mother, are, or can bee vvithout these motions: and therfore *S. Paule* sayth, that in this respect he is *carnal sold vnder sinne* that is subiect to these motions of concupiscence vvhich meite to sinne, but are noe sinne, vvhen vvee consent not to them. and this lavv of our members and cõcupiscence vvhich is contraire to the lavv of the mynd, *S. Paule* also sayth, *is death and enmitie against God and is neither subiect to the Lavv of God* (bicause it still vrgeth vs to sinne) *neither can bee*, bicause vvee can not suppresse it, though vvee may deny consent to it, vvhich only maketh it sinne, bicause sinne being voluntarie, to haue these motions is no more sinne, then to suffer the douilles tentatiõs, yea they minister matter of meritt and vertue vvhen vvee resist them.

3. Neither doth that other place of *S. Paule* to the Galathians proue the commaundements to bee impossible: bicause *S. Paule* speaketh there of the ceremonial lavv, yea (as some think) euen of the moral lavv of the *Decalogue*, and sayth, that *they whosoeuer are of the vvorkes of the lavv are vnder curse*, that is, vvhosoeuer trust only to the ceremonial or moral lawe, and not to the lavv of grace, Gal. 3.

vvhich is also called the law of faith, they are *vnder curse*, bicause the lavv pronounceth them cursed that obserue it not, vvhich yet they cā not do by vertue of the lawe, though they may by vertue of Christes grace, & by faith vvorking by charitie, vvhich is proper to the new lavv of grace. So that *sanct Paule* sayth not, that vvee can not fulfill the lavv, but only that wee cā not do it by the vertue of the bare lavve, or knowledge therof. for by & by after, he sayth, *the iust liueth by faith*, that is as S. Austin expoundeth, by faith vvorking by charitie, or by the law of grace, vvhich is called the law of faith. And that by force of *faith vvorking by charitie*, or by Christes law of grace, or by his grace wee may obserue the law, S. *Paule* cōfesseth in y^t^ same place saying, *he that doth these thinges* (to vvit which are cōmaunded by the lavv) *shall liue in them*. and in another place he sayth, *the doers of the lawe shalbe iustified*. Nether doth S. *Ambrose* in his commentaries vppon the 3. to the Galathians contradict this. For he only there proueth, that by the bare law, without faith in Christe and grace receiued from him, no man vvas iustified, or could fulfill the lawe: and although hee add *tanta mandata sunt vt impossibile sit seruare ea*; *so great are the comman-*

Aug. lib. 1. cont. duas Epist. Pelag. c. 1.

Rom. 2. 13.

*damnatus that it is impossible to keep them al*: hee meaneth the lavves of the levvee, vvhich vvere soe many that it vvas very difficile to keep them, and impossible also by vertue of that lavv, vvhich could shevv vvhat vvas sinne, but gaue no grace to avoyd it.

4. And vvhen soeuer, ether Fathers, or diuines, seem to say that it is impossible to keep the commaundements; they ether meane, that it is impossible to keep them vvithout grace by force of nature, as the *Pelagians* sayd: or that euen vvith ordinatio grace it is impossible so to keep them, as not to transgresse some of them sometymes, at least veniallie. for although euery transgression in particules bee in our povver and free choise, yet if vvee cõpare our forces to al the obseruatiõs of the lavve taken collectiue, they are soe vveake though strẽgthoned by ordinarie grace, by reason of our frayltie, that vvee all transgresse the lavv at least veniallie at one tyme or other: and so to fulfill al the lavv so perfectlie as neuer to trãsgresse any cõmaunderaẽt veniallie, is morallie impossible, though euerie obseruatiõ and trãsgressiõ in particuler bee in our povver, else it vvere no sinne. And therfore *S. Iames* sayth, that *vvee al sinne in many thinges*. And *S. Ihon*

How Papists say the lavv is impossible.

Iac. 3.

1. Ioan.

answer that if we say we haue no sinne we deceaue our selues. Or els that we are not assured in this life of the end of the law, that is, though we may loue God aboue all things, that is by a iuicunde loue, which draweth nothing in the soule hart, which may set God more the while: yet that loue cannot alway be vppermost, not in this life. For Gods commandement alwayes actually to be louing God, but not to exceede: but as this is the rule intended only in the next life, but not commaunded, so do we not thinke in our creeping vnto heere, to be voyd of sinne: neither can we so free our selues from concupiscence, as not to feele any, though we may denie consent of our will and reason vnto it. but not to feele concupiscence is not commaunded, but only in the next life: and so to feele concupiscence is not to feele sinne, sinne being transgression, concupiscence ouer vs striuing against our will. Wherefore when God commaundeth vs to loue him with all our soule, he will not fulfill the commaundement of louing God, but in the next life. For though many times God by his grace effectuously moue vs to loue him, yet the greate part of the soule be tempted in concupiscence of the flesh, &c. he labours in vain. for it is not ch-

Th. 2. 1. q. 44. a. 4. ad 2. & ar. 6. in corp.

Aug. to. 7. lib. 1. de nupt. & concup.

Calu lib. 3 Inst ca. 19.

manded to loue God vvith al our hart, as though vvee might loue nothing else: for husbandes may loue their wiues & must also, & parentes their children: nor so, that wee haue no concupiscence in vs, for wee can not bee vvithout that in this mortal life, though wee may and must deny consent; nor so that wee neuer sinne venially, for venial sinne may stand vvith charitie, grace, and Gods loue, as little iarres do not dissolue friendship nor so as that vvee must neuer leaue of louing God, bicause this is an affirmatiue precept vvhich obligeth not alvvayes: But only so, that vvee loue nothing contrarie to gods friendship: such as ye loue of a quenne is, and the honest loue of a mannes vvife is not; such also as is the loue of any creatur, in vvhose affection vvee sinne mortallie: for in these thinges vvee præferre the loue of creatures and creatures them selues before Gods loue, and God him selfe: but so to loue God as alvvayes to loue him actuallie, or neuer to loue any creatur vvith venial sinne, or neuer to feele inordinate concupiscence, or so vvhollie to bee vnited to God in affection as to loue him only, or nothing but for him actuallie; that is the end of the law intended in the next life, but

Tho. 1. 2. q. 14. ar. 6. in corp.

not commaunded. But let it bee, bicause *Luther* and *Calvin* and their scholler Sotcliff will haue it soe, that the lavv can not be fulfilled, or at least not so perfectly as is cõmaunded: vvhat shal they gayne by it? This only: that their doctrin, is lewd and wicked, which leadeth to al lewdnes and vvickednes; bicause he that is perſvvaded that he can not fulfill the commaundements, must yeeld himselfe a slaue to al sinnes, they being as impossible to be auoyded, as the cõmaundements to bee obserued, and fulfilled.

## The somme of the 8. chapter.

*Luth. in c. 2. & 4. Gal. lib. de libert. Christ. Cal. lib. 3 Inst cap. 19 §. 1. & 7. & 14.*

THis Chapter taketh as graunted, frõ our aduersaries, that we are so freed by Christe, that no lawes nether humain nor diuine do lynd in conscience: and thence cõcludeth, that vvhere no law bynds in conscience, there is no obligation, vvhere no obligation is, there is no transgression, vvhere is no transgression, there is noe sinne, and so no simple vice be made of any action, by vvhat lavve soeuer it bee prohibited: and so the gap bee made open to al sinne, vvhich is against one law, or other.

*Sotcliff answer vvith the Refutation.*

8. SOtcliff nowv trusseth vp his answer in so litle as tardle, that in lesse then thir-

tle lines, he answereth to the 8. chapters following, though some of thē bee long. And his reason why he vseth such *Laconisme*, and compendious breuitie is, because (as he saith at least) *the rest of my seuenth booke is nothing else but a rest of rayling termes, deuorged out of a sacred, and malicious stomake, and voyde of wrath, and proofe.* But why he giueth this censure rather of this part of this booke, then of the former parte, and former bookes, he only knoweth: & to *these rayling termes* which are in the rest of this seauenth booke, I thinke he cā hardlie turn with a wet fingar. Wherfore I rather thinke the reasons that moued him so bee so compendious, are; either because he could not answer, or because he was wearied, and out of breath, with so many foyles and falles, or else to shew a litle of his rayling Rethorick, and to degorge his cholerick humour which vpbraideth him.

2. But let vs heare what his breefe answer is to this 8. chapter. Certes it is no other thē is the answer to the rest of the chapters, that is a bare, yet bold denial. *I will answer breifly and plainly* (saith he) *to th' entent that hereafter he may bee better informed concerning our Religion, that Christe hath not freed vs from th' obedience of lawes, and that this is no part of our beleefe.*

But that this is the opinion of *Luther* and *Caluin*, their wordes in this chapter alleaged will make good. For *Luther* saith a Christian

Luth. in c. 2. & 4. ad Gal. lib. de libert. Christ.

*a Christian is aboue al lawes: yea that Christe and the lawe are twoe contraries incompatibles* and so ether wee must renounce Christe, or the lawe. The same he teacheth in his booke of *Christian libertie*, as the verie Title it selfe insinuateth. And commenting vppon the fifth chapter to the *Galathians*, he saith, *a true Christian is neither liber, nor seruus &c. neither a freeman, nor a bond man; neither a Iewe, nor Gentile, neither man nor woman, neither clerke nor lay man, neither Religious nor secular, neither doth he weare or pray, neither doth he contrarie, or omitte; but is indifferent and changeth, doing not doing, al the things offer them selues or offer them selues vnto him.* Caluin in his third booke of *Institutions* in the 19. chapter saith that Christian libertie

Caluin. lib 3. c. 19 §. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.

*consisteth in three thinges. The first is that the vnconscionable feare of the Lawe, when they seeke for assurance of their Iustification, do life them selues aboue the lawe, and forget al the iustice therof. For faith bringeth vs where the lawe reacheth vs not at al, and preacheth vs free, not in the iudgement of God, it hath no place in our consciences*, yea saith he, *in the same place* where the whole argument of the Epistle to the Galathians is vttered, how

§. 2.

vvee are freed from al lavvs: and then (*saith he*) who limit this libertie, as though *S. Paule* meant that vvee are free from the ceremonies of the old lavv only, they are peruerse expositours. The second part of Christian libertie, vvhich dependeth of the former, is (as *Calum saith*) this: *that our cõsciences serue not the lavv as cõstreined by necessitie of the lavv: but being deliuered from the lavv, obey freely their will of God.* But then say I, if vvee bee not bound by the lavve, though it bee vvel done to fulfill it frankelie and freelie, yet if a man vvill vse his libertie, and not obey the lavv, hee shall not sinne, (if this doctrin passe for current) bicause vvhere is no obligation, there is no sinne. According to this *Calum* sayth, that although vvee can not fulfill the lawe, and so measuring our actions by the rule of the law, finde them all sinnes: yet vvee must not therfore loose courage, *seing that by the grace of God, vvee are freed from the lavv*: or, as he saith in his french Institutions, *affranchis de la Loy. The third part of Christian libertie* (saith he) *doth teach vs not to make conscience before God of thinges exteriour, which are of themselues indifferent.* So that it is true, vvhich I sayd, that *Luther* and *Calum*, are of opinion, that by Christian libertie, vvee are so freed from al

§. 3.

§. 6.

lawes, that they can not bynd our consciences. And thus they must al teach if they will teach conformable to that *Maxime* of theirs, only faith iustifieth, as aboue in the second chapter of my Third booke I haue proued. For if faith only iustifie, then holding that, no transgression of lavv can hurt vs, bicause still by faith vvee are as iust, as before, and so the lavv bindes not in conscience, because the transgression ether is no sinne or is not imputed. Vvherfore seing that it is certain that they hold noe lavves do bynde in conscience, my former conclusion followeth certainlie and euidently, to wit, that then no faithfull man is to make scruple of any sinne, bicause if the lavv bynd not, no transgression is sinne, and so for a Christian, al is lavvfull that liketh him.

## The somme of the 9. chapter.

*LVther, Melanctho, Caluin, Beza, and others, vvhose vvordes are alleaged in the first chapter of the fifte booke, do affirme, that God is the vviller vvorker and autour of sinne, yea principal autour and instigatour: vvho also so forcible moueth vs to sinne, that wee can not resist his will & motion, as* Caluin *teacheth, and I out of him haue*

*related in the same booke and second chapter. Whence this chapter inferreth, that so the bridle is loosed to al sinne. For the sinner may thus discourse whē he is tēpted to sinne. this acte, bee it fornicatiō, aduoutrie, or murder, is the worke of God and of his will, yea he is the principal Autour, I and the deuil are only his instrumentes. why then should I be ashamed of that, of which God is not ashamed? And how can he punish mee for that in which he hath most parte and to which he moueth mee so, that I can not resist. Can I offend him in doing his will, as I do certainelie if hee bee the viller of sinne? I will sinne then freelie, because God will haue me: and I doubt not but to be excused because he constraineth, and I need not feare any offence of God, sith I shall rather please him in obeying his will.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

*SEcondly wee pronounce them* (saith he) *Anathema, that shal say that God is th' Autour of sinne, and haue I trust fully discharged maister Caluin from this most iniust imputation.* But I, Sir Deane, do not only trust, but do know, and so doth the Reader also, that Caluin & other your maisters hold, that God is the *Autour, worker*, and viller of all sinne, and that you haue not discharged them: and

Abone, booke fifte chap. 1.

therfore if you vvil stand to your vvorde, you must pronounce your Anathema against your owne maisters.

## The Somme of the 10. chapter.

*THis chapter relateth fiue opinions of our aduersaries vvhich aboue are set down in their owne vvordes: as that the lavve is impossible; that vvee haue noe free vvil; that God imputeth no sinne to faithful man; that al our actions are sinnes; that God is th' Autour of sinne: Vvhence is inferred that there is no vertue nor vice in our actions, for if the lavv be impossible it byndeth not: if it byndeth not it is no sinne to trāsgresse it: If wee haue no free vvil, vvee do al of necessitie, and so are not prayse vvorthy vvhen vvee seem to do wel, nor to bee blamed vvhen wee seem to do ill, and so haue nether vertue nor vice in our actions: If God impute no sinne to a Christian, then in him is no sinne, for othervvise God should not bee a right esteemer of thinges: If al our actions bee sinnes, then is there no good nor vertue in them, because,* bonum est ex integra causa: *If God bee the Autour of sinne, then sinne is according to his vvil and consequently offendeth him not, but rather pleaseth him and so also is no sinne. Vvhat then should vvee care for vertue? vvhy should vvee feare sinne? They are but vvordes, there is no such*

*such thing answerable to the names of vertue and sinne. And so the dore standes open to let in al vice.*

*Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

*THirdlie wee take them to bee brutish heretikes in the forme of men* (sayth *Sotcl.*) *that do not diligentlie distinguish betweene vertue and vice:* & this is al he answereth. *In our doctrin ther is not the least suspition* of any such matters. Vvherfore his assertion I take for my maior proposition: and then I subsume for my minor: but you do not distinguish diligently, not at al betvveen vice and vertue, bicause you take avvay both (as is proued ued by mee, & not answvered by you) *ergo* you are brutish heretikes.

## The Somme of the eleuenth chapter.

*THis chapter discourseth at large of conscience, defineth vvhat it is, and vvhat a svvay it beareth in the life of man, yea in a cõmon vvealth, vvhen a lavv, a iudge, a vvitnes, an accuser, a condemner and Torturer: and so to take avvay conscience is to open the Gap to al outrages, especiallie vvhen the temporal iudge and his sentence can bee auoyded. The aduersaries take avvay con-*

science by 5. pointes of their doctrine. for first if to a faithfull man (as they say) no sinne is imputed, vvhy should hee make a conscience or scruple of it? Secondlie they auerre that wee haue no freewill, vvhence I haue inferred that then vvee commit no sinne in any action, vvhy then should we feare sinne vvhere ther is no sinne? Thirdly they affirm that by Christe vvee are freed from al obligation of lavves, and then say I, vvee need not make any scruple to transgresse them. Fourthly they are of opinion that the commaundementes are impossible; and thence I inferre that no man must make a conscience of not fulfilling them, it being not in his power. Fiftly they teach that God is the Autour of sinne vvhy then should the sinner make a scruple of that, of vvhich God him selfe maketh no conscience, though he bee the vvorker, vviller, and principal autour therof?

*Sotcliffes Answer vvith the Refutation.*

FOurthly (saith Sotc.) of conscience vvee speake according to the holy Apostle, that groundeth it not vppon the Popes Decretales, but vppon the lavv of God. But if nether Gods lavves nor mens lavves bynd in conscience (as you say, and as aboue in the 8. chapter I haue proued you must say) then need you

make no scruple of any lavv: As for vs, wee make a conscience of Gods lawes and mennes lavves, and consequentlie of the Popes Decretales, and the Churches and Bishops lavves, because they do al bynd in conscience, as aboue I haue proued in the fift booke: you need not to make any scruple of any lavv, and so by this and other doctrines, do take avvay al conscience. According to this doctrine the vvorld seeth hovv litle studie of cases of cõscience is amongest you, vvhat abuse there is in your court of conscience, and hovv litle conscience is amongest you. Vvherfore Beza saith, *that the ancient Fathers and Christians had more conſcience* (in vvhich I beleeue him) *but leſſe ſcience, and that you contrarivvise haue leſſe conſcience, but more ſcience and knowledge:* in which in hast I can not beleeue him, hauing discouered so many of your grosse errours. And so conscience by your doctrine being taken avvay, my former cõclusion standeth still in force against you. Beza ep. 1. Theol.

## The somme of the tvvelueth chapter.

*THis Chapter ſheweth, hovv the Reformers open the gappe to pride, the firſt ſinne and ſource of al ſinne. Firſt they teach that vvee muſt*

assure ouv selues of Salvation yea and election: vvhich must needes breed a great pride and careles-nesse in men so perswaded, as contrariwise, Catholikes take occasion to humble them selues, in that though thy hope to bee saued, yet they alvvayes feare the vvorst and so are not careless. Secondly they say vvee are iuste by Christes iustice, whence aboue in the third Booke and 8. Chapter I haue inferred, that they are as iuste as Christe, and so may compare vvith him, vvhich is Luciferian pride. Thirdlie they affirm that euery one by his prinat Spirit, is to Iudge vvhat is Scriptur, and vvhich is the true meaning, vvhich is to make them selues euerie one Supreme Iudges vvho are not subiect to any Popes Councels or Churches, but by their Spirit may Iudge of them, as Luther saith he vvil be Iudge not only of them but also of Angells; vvhich is a mad and frantick Pride. But hovv proud in vvordes they are, I haue aboue related.

aboue fol. 214.

## The somme of the thirteenth chap.

THis Chapter shevveth hovv all creatures euen to the Elementes, Heauens, starres, Planets, and Plantes do trauel, euerie one in their kinde. amongest vnreasonable creatures, the trauels of bees and antes is noted. The angels also are in continual

*action, man was born to labour; euen in Paradise he had his taxe apponted him; to signifie the vertuous actions which are called good vvorkes in vvhich the soule should bee occupied. Certes, mannes felicitie cõsisting in action that is in the continual cleare vision and fruition of God, the meanes to attain vnto it, must not bee an Idle faith only vvhich apprehendeth Christes Iustice but doeth nothing, nor yet must the meanes consist in Idlenes or doing nothing, but in good vvorkes and obseruation of the commaundementes, so often inculcated in Scriptur. Vvho so considereth howv vnvvoorthy mans nature idlenes is, and howv it is the nurse of al vices, he can say no lesse. But if al our actions be damnable sinnes, as Luther, and Caluin, whoue in the fifthe Chapter say: If faith only iustifieth vvithout good vvorkes, as in the first Chapter of this seuenth booke vvee haue hard them also say: Then the perfection of Christian life is an idle faith, vvhich apprehendeth but doeth nothing, yea then a Christians perfection is to bee idle and to do nothing, bicause it is better to bee idle then ill occupied. And so the Artificer shal attain to perfection in his arte by continual exercise, vvee shall in a trice arrive at the port of Christian perfection by apprehending only and doing nothing. And so man shal scale the vvalles of the Citie of heauen vvithout labour, get the victorie vvithout figh-*

ting, vvine the goale vvithout running, gain the vvages vvithout vvorking.

## The somme of the fourteenth chap.

AFter a long commendation of Chastitie and especiallie virginitie vvhich is proued to be gratefull vnto God, conformable to Scriptures fathers practise of the primatiue Church and reason: I declare hovv Luther makes the vvay to all sensualitie. First in taking avvay al the Impedimentes of matrimonie constituted by the Church, to crosse the vvay of sensualitie, and to make the state of matrimonie more decent. Secondly in denying that chastitie may bee vovved or being vovved can or ought to be Kept. Thirdly preferring matrimonie before virginitie. Fourthly in permitting Polygamie and pluralitie of vvines. not only one after another (vvhich Luther permitteth not only in case of fornication, but also as often as the vvife vvill be gadding or will not satisfie hir Husbād) but also together: Bucer addeth that as often as the man is vveary of the former vvife, he may marry a nother. Caluin giueth leaue also to take another vvife in case of fornication: And according to their doctrine vvhich teacheth that it is impossible to liue chastlie or to resist the tentations of the flesh vnlesse a man haue the guift, vvhich al haue not in their opi-

Lurh. to. 5. ser. de matrim. li. de capti. Babe de matr. & in 1 cor. 7. & in propos. de Bigamia.

Bucer. in ca. 19. matt. Calu. li. 4. Instit. c. 19. §. 37.

nion, and none knoweth whether he haue it, for then it is lawfull to take another wife when the former doth not satisfie sensualitie, yea and a queane also when a wife can not be gotten, for no man is bound to liue without a woman, that being impossible as Luther saith it is, when especially the Tentation commeth. And so when the wife is sicke, or absent, the Husband may take another wife or queane, and she in the like case another man, because the Tentation coming it can not bee resisted, and so necessitie (which is the best excuse) will excuse from sinne. which doctrine, what a wide gap it layeth open to sensualitie, the Reader easelie perceiueth.

## The somme of the fifteenth chapter.

THis Chapter shewveth how the Reformed doctrin not only tumbleth vs headlong into al vice, but also holdeth vs captiues in the prison of sinne, by an impossibilitie of rising vp again from the state of sinne. For they hold (as aboue in the first Chapter of this booke wee haue seen) that the only way for a sinner to bee iust, is to beleeue that hee is iust, and that Christes iustice in particuler is his: which being impossible for him presentlie after sinne to beleeue assuredlie, without any mutation experienced in him selfe or reuelation from God

*(for the vnderstanding can not assent to al things, nor vvithout some probabilitie proposed) it followeth that being once a sinner, he can neuer bee otherwise. For as, if the only vvay for a sinner to bee cured, vvere to beleeue that he is in good health before he experience that his disease hath left him, hee should, neuer be healed because he could neuer so long as he is in his wittes, beleeue it: so neither can a sinner bee healed from the disease of sinne, because he knowing that he cometh from sinne and is still in the same state, can not beleeue that hee is iust or that Christe, iustice in particuler is his, Christe haueing dyed for al vvho yet are not al therfore iustified in particuler.*

*Sotcliffes answer to these Chapters, vvith the Refutation.*

Sotcliffe vvith one breathe and one answer disputeth these fovvre Chapters. *Vvee hate al pride* (saith hee) *knowing that humilitie is the cognisance of Christians: vvee exhort men to labour diligentlie: vvee hold marriage is honourable among al degrees of men, and say that God vvill iudge adulterers and fornicators: vvee teach chastitie, vvee punish vnchast and lecherous persons: finallie our doctrin doth shevv the way for sinners to arise.* But this being no answer to my argumentes, but a bare denyal of my

conclusions, vvhich the vnlernedst Minister of Musterdmaker, might as vvell haue afforded al this Minister: I can giue him no reply, hee hauing giuen no answver, nether can I further encounter vvith him he running avvay like a covvard and refusing the encounter. And so my conclusions stand al in force: and *Sotcliffes* Religion opening the gap to vice, falleth of it selfe.

## AN ANSVVER TO SOTcliffes *Appendix or Addition to the fift, sixt, and seeuenth Booke.*

KELLISON.

1. *Sotcliffe* novv like a fensor driuen out of his play, striketh so cõfusedlie, that he seemes not to care where his blovves light, soe they light some where, though on the ground on stones, or on his ovvn pate. For vvheras hee vndertaketh to shevv hovv Catholiques doctrin is iniurious to God, and to Princes, and fauorable to vice: He hit carpeth at mãners of the Catholikes then at a point or tvvo of their doctrin, yet so, as he cõfoundeth both. cõcerning their mãners he alleageth S. *Bernard, Petrarch, Breidenbach, Auentinus, Honorius Augustodunensis, Petrus de Alliaco, Theodoric of Niem*, and

*Relat:* Vvho complain of th' euil life of Catholique Christians, Priests, and Religious; al vvhich, if I graunted him to bee true vvhat should hee gain therby? May not men liue othervvise then their doctrine teacheth them? As Christe said to his disciples and others: *In the chaire of Moyses do sit the Scribes and Pharisies, do that vvhich they teach, but do not vvhat they doe:* so say I to *Sotcliff*, doe as the Catholike Pastours (vvhich fill the Seates of Peter and the Apostles) haue taught & deliuered, and thou shalt neuer do amisse; but I vvish thee not alvvayes to do as they do. for they being mē, frayle as al others, and more assaulted by the deuil then others are (for as the Tempestes do ayme most against highe hilles, and hovvses, so do the deuills bend their greatest forces against those that are hight in dignitie, knovving that they neuer fal alone) do teach one thing and do another. But as roses, are not to bee contemned bicause they grovv on thornes, nor gold to be refused bicause it is digged out of the earth, nor Physick to be neglected bicause a diseased Physitian prescribeth it: so nether is Catholike doctrine to bee reiected, bicause some Catholike Doctors vvho teach it, liue not according as they teach. But in verie dead some of these Authors vvhoe complaine of Catholikes euil life spake of Splein and enuie, and they al speake hiperbolicallie, complaining of the faultes of the Clergie & Religious, because many of them are faultie, though many also and the greater parte, liue vvithout scandal. To *Petrarches*, and *S. Bernardes*

complaintes *Bellarmin*, hath anſvvered to vvhom I referre the Reader. Here only I ſay that greater are the complaintes and lamētations of the vices, of the *Lutheranes*, *Zuinglianes*, *Caluiniſtes*, made by your ovvn doctours, euen by *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and *Caluin* them ſelues, as aboue vvee haue ſeen: vvhere to this obiection I haue anſvvered *Sorcliff* ſufficiently, though perchaunce haue not ſatisfied nor fitted his humour.

2. Then concerning doctrine he ſayth *the Popes take vppon them to diſpēſe vvith al ſinne and vvickednes:* That Indulgences and confeſſion are cauſes of ſinne, and ſuch like ſtuff he hath vvhich I count not vvorthy anſvvering.

# THE TITLE OF THE EIGHT BOOKE.

*The eight Booke conteineth a Surueyof their Doctrin vvhich leadeth to Atheism and contempt of Religion.*

## The Somme of the first chapter.

WHAT God is, can not be discouered in this life, yet, that there is a God is demonstrated by eight very euident and conuincing argumentes, vvherof the first is taken from the creation of the great vvorld, vvhich could not be of it selfe but of a cause aboue al nature vvhich is God. The second from the framing of the litle vvorld man, from the creation of the Angels, and the Heauens, for the first man, Angels, and the Heauens, could be created of no second cause, but only of the first cause, God. The third is taken from the goodly order and disposition of the fovvre Elementes, the Heauens and

their revolutions, of the partes and members of beastes bodies, plantes and trees: which order could not happen by chaunce as at large is proued, but only by the intelligent Artificer God who hath set downe this order and disposition so admirable. The fourth the wittie operatiõs of wittles brute beastes do argue a God who being indewed with infinit reason and knowing what is best to direct them most conuenientlie to their proper endes hath ingraued in them instincts of natur by which they proceed as orderlie as if they had reason: as is exemplified in sheep and byrdes that feare their aduersaries in sheep which grazing in a medow do seeldom or neuer chuse poisonfull or euil hearbes though altogether like to others, in the spider who so cunningly worketh and placeth his cobwebbet, in Antes who make their prouision and conserue it so prouidently, in bees who haue a kind of common wealth amongest them: In hares subtilitie, and foxes craftines. The fift is taken from the dependence of thinges one of another: for whatsoeuer is in this world it is not of it selfe but of another: and so at length wee must come to a thing which being of it selfe hath created al thinges, which can be no other thing then a first cause and mouer, which moueth al thinges it selfe being immouable. The other 3. argumets are moral: whereof the first and sixt is taken from vertue and vice

which are found in our Actions whereof the first (as euen Philosophers haue acknowledged) deserueth reward the second punishement: and seing that in this life, nether vertue is rewarded, nor vice punished dulie (because many tymes the vitious flowe in prosperitie, and the vertuous are contemned) it followeth that ther is another life and in it God who hath care of all, to assigne to euerie one his iust reward or punishment. The Seeuenth is taken from the voice of the vvorld, because there vvas neuer nation which called not on God or Gods. An in extreme daunger of drovvning or other death, the Atheists them selues by instinct of natur, when al creatures fayle them, vvould haue recourse to some thing about the order of creatures. The eight is taken from the remorse which sinners haue and the feare of a Godhead amid their pastimes and pleasures. By vvhich argument especiallie as they are handled in the Survey, a Godhead is convinced. Then I shevv breefly (the groundes being layed before) hovv our Reformers, open the Gap to the denyal of a Godhead, for affirming that God is the autour of sinne and commaundeth thinges impossible, make him an euil God, an vnreasonable and cruel Tyrant, as in the fift booke is alreadie declared: and so induce men to Atheism, vvho vvill rather choose vvith Diagoras and Protagoras to think, that ther is no

*God as al then that he is of ſo badde, cruel, Churliſh and malicious natur.*

*Sotcliffes anſwer vvith the Refutation.*

1. IN my præface before this booke, I ſayd that *Ireland* is famous for that it breedes no toades, nor venimous ſerpentes, and *Ingland* not vnhappie, for that it hath no vvolues, but yeat is grovvn vnfortunate of late, for a monſter called Atheiſt vvhich hereſie hath bread in her. At vvhich *Sotcliff* ſo chafeth and fumeth as though he needed in owler to vvalke him: and ſayth that this monſter came out of Italie accompained vvith Sodomie, and yet can not deny but that hereſie brought the in to our countrie being as free as any, from ſuch monſters, ſo long as it is vvas free from hereſie. As touching the conclution of this chapter he denyeth it as he is vvont to doo. To the præmiſes he anſvvereth that Luther Caluin & others by me charged teach no ſuch thing as I make them to teach God to be the authour of ſinne and to commaund thinges impoſſible, and thence inferreth my concluſion: he ſayth I haue *powred out of my vvide mouth a ſtreame of impudent ſlaunders*, and addeth that I proue not my charge out of

their vvritings, and that I know that they teach contrarie. But I had aboue alleaged the Autours of that doctrin, as he could not be ignoraunt, and had referred him to my fift booke vvhere I haue euidently demonstrated that they teach that God is autour of sinne and commaundeth thinges impossible: and so my conclusion must needes followe (though *Sotcliff* breake vvith swelling anger) to vvit that God is of an euil nature vvorking and vvilling all sinne, vnreasonable in commaunding impossibilities, cruel in punishing vvith hel fier the transgressors of lavves impossible, and so the occasion is giuen to make men believe, that rather there is no God then such a God. As for *Sotcliffes* answer, to vvit, that God is not cruel in punishing for not obseruing lavves vvhich vvee can not because by our ovvn fault vvee fel in to this our impotencie, it is aboue reiected.

2. As touching my argumentes vvhich proue a *God-head*: he sayth *they are vveake*, but yet nether disproueth thē nether bringeth better: and so though he dare not deny a God, yet he vvould not haue my reasons to be of that force as to proue a God: though in deed they are the principal reasons

sons, and almost the only reasons, which diuines and Philosophers do vse to conuince a diuinitie and Godhead. But although he can not infringe my argoments, yet he snatcheth here and there without staying (as the dogges neere Nilus do) at certain speeches of myne vsed in those argoments. And first of all he displeaseth him that I say pag. 64. *that creatures in God are increate, infinit, perfect, and that all of them in God are God.* But if he were not an ignorant fellow that knowes neither Diuinitie nor Philosophie, he would neuer mislike that manner of speeche. I sayd in deed that God (as being the cause of all) conteineth eminently in him selfe the perfections of all creatures, not that according to their formal, & create essences they are to bee found in God, but that they are in him as the effect is said to bee in the cause, and as the peece of vvorke is in the Artificers Idea and mental platform. So gold and siluer and other metalles are in the Sunne, bicause the sunne generating them in the bovvels of the earth, is cause of them: and so conteineth them as the cause doth the effect, and they are conteined in the Sunne as in their cause and so haue a nobler being in the Sunne then in them selues, and in the

Sunne are the Sunne: and yet if *Sotc.* would therfore looke for Cornish Tinne in the Sunne he might as soone fynd it there as a man in the moone. So the Artificers brazen statua before it bee cast in the mould is cast by conceit in his Idea, bicause according to that, he casteth it, and so the brazen statua is in the Idea and mētal platform of the artificer, and hath a more noble being there then in the massie peece of brasse. So I say al creatures are in God, but in God haue a more noble being then in them selues, being in God increate vvithout al imperfection, yea being in God, God. for as the effect, as it is in the cause or *Idea*, hath a more noble being then in it selfe, and as noble as is the being of the cause it selfe, so creatures as in God, are God. This I haue explicated by a fit similitude of lines drawn from the Center: for as they in the Center, are the Center, and out of the Center haue a nother distinct being one from a nother: So al creatures vvhich are so many lines drawn from the infinit *Center*, and resting place of al thinges, *God*: as they are out of God, they haue create, and distinct beinges, but as in God they are God. Vvhich is the doctrin of *Dionysius Areopagita*, *S. Thomas* and al diuines and Phi-

Dionysius cap. 5. de diuin. nom. Tho. 1. p. q. 4. art. 1.

losophers: yea it is S. Austines doctrin, who *tract. 1. in Ioan.* saith that al thinges in God are *life* though *in seipsis vita non sunt*, though in them selues they are not life. And *l. 11. de Ciuit. Dei. ca.* 29. he saith, that as lines and figures drawn in the dust are otherwise in the mynde of the drawer, otherwise in the dust: so creatures are otherwise in Gods *Idea* otherwise in them selues. And so *Sotcliffes* illarions against this doctrin, to wit that this doctrin maketh no distinction betwixt God and creatures, and aduanceth creatures to a diuine being, and that hence followeth that God in a stone is a stone, are friuolous: bicause creatures in the selues can neuer be God, but in their first cause God, they are God as Gold in the myne is not the sunne, but in the Sunne it hath the being of the Sunne, and yet the Sunne in Gold is not Gold or any other metal & the shoe in the Shoe makers mental platforme hath intellectual and spiritual being, and yet on the last it is but leather.

3. Secondly he findeth fault that I sayd *pag. 625. S. Anthony by the booke of the world counted a God-head*, as though saith *Sot. he meant to ouercome god.* In the same place he cauilleth at al those wordes of myne: *For first I demaund of*

vvhom thus vvorld, vvhich Philosophers do call (All) because it conteineth al, receued his being. And saith that I shal hardely be able to shew in vvhat tongue Philosophers cal the vvorld Alle. Certes you are al Sotte to cauil thus. do not Philosophers call the world *vniuersum*, Alle? Read Sir *Philip Sydneyes Arcadia*, and you shall find that he (as good an Inglishman as you) vseth the same vvord in the same sense.

4. Thirdly he saith, that *pag.* 648. I bely *Cesar*, in making him say that *the first inhabitauntes of England sprung out of the Earth as herbes or Toadstooles dot*. Read *Cesar* you shal finde that he sayeth the like, & read *Cambden*, and you shall fynd that he fathereth the same saying on *Cesar* as vvel as I: saying that *Cesar, Diodorus*, and others, *Britannos aborigines, & Aborigenes, id est, non aliunde aduectos fuisse coluerint, hominesque plantarum, & fungorum instar è terra in principio germinasse suspicati sunt*: though D. *Vvhite* in his first booke of the *Histories of Britannie* thinke, he meant only that the first inhabitauntes were vnknown. Fourthly he saith that I, *pa.* 649. vvould gladly proue that there is a God by conuulsions of men possessed: and *pag.* 650. by vvitches. But this is not truly sayd of him, for I proue deuilles

Camb. pa. 5. edit. vlt.

D. Vvhite pa. 5. no. 12.

by cõuulsions and other signes of possessed persons, and by effectes of vvitches and by deuilles vvhich could not bee generated of any second cause, I proue a God vvho created them of nothing good angels, though they by sinne made them selues deuilles. After this he snatcheth at Bees and leapes after hares and foxes and Spiders, brought in by mee more to the purpose then hee vvould haue the Reader to beleeue.

5. Lastlie vvhich I should haue noted first, vvheras I sayd that in this life though vvee may demonstrate *that God is, yet, nether by the light of reason, nor faith vvee can discouer vvhat God is*: hee saith, *that I am a silly Doctor of diuinitie if I deny that Scriptures teach vs vvhat God is, as farr as is necessarie.* To these trifeles a man must answer that vvill Deale vvith a Trifeler. Vvhat I sayd I learned of no Syllie but a sound and Angelical Doctour S. *Thomas* of *Aquin*: vvhee he saith that hauing demonstrated that ther is a God, *inquirendum restat quomodo sit, vt sciatur de eo quid sit: sed quia de eo scire non possumus quid sit &c. it remaineth to inquire hovv he is, that vvee may knovv vvhat he is: but because vvee can not knovv vvhat he is, but rather vvhat he is not, vvee can not consider hovv he is, but hovv he is* 1. p. q. 3 in prooemio.

not. I learned the same doctrin of a great Doctour (whose desire you are not worthy to bee) S. Ihon Damascen, who teacheth me this assertion: *In Deo autem impossibile est quidnam essentia sua ac natura ipse sit dicere, aptiusque est ex omnium rerum sublatione atque inficiatione operationem habere, neque enim eorum quæ sunt, quicquam est: In God it is impossible to tel what he his by nature and essence, and more fitly do wee take knowledge of him by denying thinges on him, bicause he is none of the thinges that are.* Damasc. l. 1. de fide. c. 4.

Whereas Sotcliff saith that *Scriptur teacheth what God is as farre as is necessarie:* I deny his assertion. For as by Philosophie wee know that God is, that he is one only God, and the first cause and last end of all thinges: so by scriptur and faith, wee know that he is three persons and one God, that he is the blisse of al the blessed, that he is iuste, merciful wise, good, omnipotent, immense, and so forth: but what these attributes in God are wee know not, bicause wee conceue not these thinges as they are, but as if they were accidental habits and perfections, and as if his immensitie were like an infinit quantitie and extension, which yet is not in God. The reason of this is bicause our soule in this life, nether in natural, nor supernatural verities, seeth any

Wee know not what god is.

The reason.

thing but thorough the vvindowes, of the body and organes of the soule and sences: and bicause our senses are acquainted only vvith sensible obiectes, vvhatsoeuer wee apprehend of God or Angels, wee apprehend as sensible and corporal obiectes. For as looking thorovv redde or green glasse, vvee imagin al to bee redd or green, though they bee blacke or vvhite: so the soule looking thorough the coloured, dustie, and corporal vvindowes of the body, imagineth al to be bodies, and corporal thinges, or coloured: and therfore vvhether shee contemplate God, or Angels, or her own selfe (to vvhom shee should bee best knovvn) shee conceiueth of God as of a graue and maiestical iudge or Prince, of Angels as of litle flying children, of her selfe as some such like thing. So that though vvee knovv that there is a God, that hee is iust, mercifull, Good, and so forth; yet vvee knovv not vvhat in deed hee is, or vvhat these diuine perfections are, bicause vvee conceue them not as they are, but as our sences teach vs. For what is more easilie to bee knovvn in God then that he is. And yet *S. Dionysius Areopagita* saith, that *God is not*, that is in such manner as wee conceue, and as creatures are. Vvhat seemes

a similitude.

Dionys. c. 7. de diuinis nom.

more manifest then that God is a substaunce? and yet *Boetius* saith, *substantia in illo non est vere substantia, sed vltra substantiam*: In him is not trulie substaunce, but beyond substaunce.

Poet. li. de Trinit. circa medi.

Dionys. c. 6. 7. de diuinom. Tho. ibid.

VVherfore *Dionysius Areopagita*, and S. *Thomas* of *Aquin*, distinguish three. vvaies by vvhich vvee knovv God in this life. The first is by denial of creatures, as if a man should saye God is neither man nor Angel, nor Sunne nor mone, nether is he a substaunce or spirit, as creatures are. And bicause thus vvc knovv rather vvhat God is not, then vvhat he is, Dionysius sayth wee know God by ignorance. So he saith God is not ens or substaunce, to vvit, as creatures are. The second vvay is not by denyal, but by excellent affirmation as if vvee should say God is not ens nor substaunce, nor spirit to vvit as vvee conceue, and as creatures are but aboue our conceipte and capacitie of al creatures. So *Boetius* sayd God is not substaunce, but super substaunce. So *Elias Cretensis* sayth God is, *supra mentem mens, & supra vitam vita, & demque supra omnia*; aboue vnderstading, vnderstanding, aboue life, life, and aboue al things, the only highest thing. The third vvay is by creatures by which as by the effectes of God vvee come to knovvledge of him as the

in orat. 14 Naz.

cause, cõseruer, gouernor, & end of all. And thus vvee know only *an sit*, of God and his perfections, by *demonstratio quia*, vvhich proceedeth frõ the effect to the cause. but vvee know not *quid sit*, by *demõstratio propter quid*, vvhich by the cause demõstrateth the effect, bicause there is no cause of God or any his diuine attributes, al in him being God. And so in this life vvee knovv only that God is, that he is iuste, mercifull, omnipotẽt, immẽse, and so forth; but bicause vvee conceiue of God, as of some material thing, and of his attributes as of accidental or partial and distinct perfections, therfore vvee knovv not vvhat God is, hauing no *quidditatiue* or cleare knowledge of him. For he is not patched vp as his creatures are of essense, existence, and substaunce nor perfected by accidentes as we are, bicause he is not so much vvise, as vvisdõ it selfe, not so much iuste as iustice it selfe, not so much beautifull as beautie it selfe, not so much happie as blisse it selfe: immense vvithout quantitie, æternal vvithout beginning or ending euer moving without mutation, filling al places yet not cõteined, conteining al thinges yet not excluded, full of al perfection, vvithout composition or diuision, angrie vvhitout passion, louing

Plut. li. de doct. Pla. Plato.

vvithout affection, punishing vvhithout reuenge, giuing al thinges vvithout despoiling him selfe of any thing, conteining in him selfe al thinges, hee but one thing. And bicause vvee can not conceite these thinges vvee knovv only that God is, and is al these thinges, but can not comprehend vvhat he or al these thinges in him are, yea rather know what he is not, then what he is.

## The somme of the second chapter.

*After a discourse concerning the commendation of Religion, I proue by diuers chapters and argumentes of the former bookes, that the Catholike Church and Religiõ, is the only true Church and vvorshipp of God. then supposing the forme doctrin, of the reformers, to vvit, that God is the autour of sinne and so of an euil nature: that he cõmaundeth impossibilities, and so is vnreasonable, that he punisheth the transgressours of these impossible lawes, and so is barbarous and cruel: I inferre out of these premisses, that men being perswaded that God is euil, vnreasonable, and cruel, may feare him, but vvil neuer loue or honour him, and so this doctrin openeth the gapp to irreligiositie, contempt of al Religion, and Atheism it selfe.*

*Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

HE sayth he *declared the antecedent to bee false and so shal not need to beat my ruinous consequent.* but my antecedēt vvas, that you teach God to be the Autour of sinne, to cōmaund lavves impossible, and yet to punish the transgressors ætternallie, vvhich also I haue conuinced to bee Luthers Caluins and other your brethrens doctrin: and thence haue inferred God to bee of an euil natur, vnreasonable and barbarously cruel, and so the cōsequence of this chapter must needes go for current, to vvit, that then men may feare God, but can neuer loue or honour him; vvhence followeth contempt of Religion. As for the argumentes insinuated, by vvhich I haue aboue proued the Catholike Religiō to be the true worship of God, and that the new Religiō of Ingland is not, though *Sotcliff* here braggeth, that he hath refuted thē, yet the iudicious Reader hath seen that he braggeth of more then he hath been able to performe. And as concerning the doctrines, by him specified, to vvit, *blovving vp Princes and Parlament hovvses vvith gunpovvder, breaking of Oathes, lying, and equiuocating, The Popes vniuersal Monarchie,*

*Kissing the Popes Pantoufle, iustification by confirmation, Extreme vnction, Mariage, and Orders ex opere operato, of taking Christe vvith the teeth, of Transubstantion, halfe communions, priuat Masses, prayer in a tongue not vnderstood, vvorship of Saintes and Angels*, vvhich he biddeth mee proue *to bee conformable to that Religion vvhich was first planted by the Apostles*: I haue aboue proued al these as farre as vvee teach them: as for *blowing vp Princes and Parlament houses vvith Gunpovvder*, vvee teach it not but dissalovv it. Kissing the Popes Pantoufle, is no point of faith but a ceremonie, as kneeling to the King in England is, as for *lying & breaking* Oathes, you may take them to your selues, the other pointes I haue already proued conformable to the Apostles and primatiue Church.

## The somme of the third chapter.

*THis chapter sheweth how the reformers in outhrowing the Catholike Churches authoritie do outhrow al scripture and Religion in question. For if the Catholique Romain Church may and hath de facto erred (as they say) shee hath most grossely, and hath played also the Idolatresse) then can they not haue any assurance of scripture by her authoritie, because if she hath erred in other thinges, she may erre also in taking bookes for Canonical scripture, vvhich are not, and so by this authoritie they haue no assu-*

rance of scripture. yea although Luther and others say, that they will at least take scriptures vppon the Romain Churches credit, yet they can not: for her authoritie being the same, if they will not receive other thinges on her authoritie, neither can they credit scripture, for her her authoritie being the same in al thinges. Neither can they haue any assurance of scripture by their owne Church: because first, it was not their Church, but the Romain Church of which Luther tooke the scriptures at his first preaching. Secondly if the true Church may erre, theirs also though it were the true Church might erre in making choise of these bookes for Canonical. Neither by tradition can they bee assured of scripture: neither by ancient tradition of their owne Church, because it was not extant before Luther (as aboue is proued) and therefore not of that Church, but only of the Romain Church, Luther receiued scripture. neither by tradition of the Romain Church, because tradition being nothing else but a custome, practise, or opinion not written, but deliuered by the Church from tyme to tyme: if the Romain Church for aboue 1000. yeares hath erred (euen by their confession) in the sacrifice of the Masse, in worshiping of Images, praying to Saintes and for the dead (as aboue is prooued) that hath thus long erred, of these be errours) these might easily inducteuring forged for true scriptures. By scripture likewise can not be assured of scripture: because scripture doth not giue testimonie that these bookes are scripture: And if it did, yet as I may doubte whether these bookes are scripture so might I doubt whether this testimonie of scripture, be scripture. not by the Phrase of scripture, because diuers bookes of scriptures haue diuers Phrases and stiles, and other bookes not scripture, may haue the like or a better Phrase. not by the Spirit: because as this spirit may deceiue in the

*meaning of scriptur as aboue in the first booke vvee haue seen so may it deceue vs in the bookes of scriptur, as it must needes deceue* Luther *or* Caluin *hee holding the Epistle of S. Iames not to bee scripture,* Caluin *holding it to bee, and so the spirit deceiueth one of them. And so the Catholique Romain Churches authoritie (vvhich hetherto the vvorld hath credited) being denyed there is no more assurance in the reformed Church of scriptur or any historie or mysterie of faith reuealed in it, then of a Robbin Hoods tale. And so all Christian Religion is brought in question: and sins there is no reason to perswaded men to bee either Turkes or Iewes, if they forsake the Catholike Romain Church, they haue no reason to be of any Religion, and so the gap is open to Atheism and contempt of al Religion.*

## *Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

SOtcliff is so confused in this answere, that it is hard to knovv vvhere to haue him. but it seemeth that his answere, at lenght, cometh to this: that the Church of Rome is not the true Church, and that therfore vvee are not to stand to her iudgement nor the Popes determination, vvho (as this Aleheaded minister sayth) is a beetle headed follovv and an ennemie & oppressor of the Church. But first I haue proued aboue that the Romain Church is the true Church, and the Pope her lavvfull cheefe and visible Pastour, and that the true Church cā not erre, noe nor her cheefe Pastour, in deciding

cõtrouersies of Religion and determining vvhich is ſcriptur and the meaning of it. Secondly if this Church bee not to be credited in this matter then are not you in any aſſuraunce of Scriptur, hauing receiued it frõ her, & from her only. And then I demaund vvhat Church muſt bee beleeued? And he can alleage none but his ovvn: which yet (as many tymes I haue demonſtrated) can not be the true Church, nor her Paſtours, true Paſtours. Thirdly although it were the true Church, yet the true Church may erre as you commonly hold: and ſo nether thus can you haue any aſſuraunce of Scriptures your aſſuraunce being grounded on a fallible ground. By what authoritie then, or by vvhat meanes are you aſſured of Scriptur? To this he anſwereth mũme, and ſo my former concluſion goeth ſtill for current.

## The ſomme of the fifte chapter.

*THe Reformers are content to receue* Scriptur *of the* Romain Church *(as in deed ſhee from tyme to tyme Kept Scriptur elſe* Luther *had not found it) yet they vvill not receue the number of the bookes of Scriptur from her, but will take or refuſe vvhat pleaſeth them ſelues. vvherein they contrarie them ſelues: becauſe her*

*authoritie being one and the same: if they beleeue her for Scripture they must beleeue her for the number of the bookes of Scripture: or if they beleeue her not for that, neither do they beleeue her for that. And seing that there is no other assurance of Scripture, if her authoritie be reiected, then (as aboue is proued) it followeth that they haue no certaintie of Scripture, nor consequently of the contents of Scripture: and so refusing the Romain Church, they haue iust cause to doubte of Scripture and the contents thereof, and consequently of all Religion, as in the former Chapter is referred.*

*Sotcliffes Answer with the Refutation.*

1. SOtcliff before he answereth the drifte of my argumēt, he saith that the bookes of *Iudith, Tobie, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom*, and the *Machabees*, which I sayd they refuse, can neuer be proued to bee Canonical. And as concerning my charging of *Luther* to haue called the booke of *Iob* a tale, to haue iested at *Ecclesiasticus*, to haue called *S. Ihons* Gospel the principal, to haue reiected th' *Epistle* to the *Hebrewes*, th' *Epistles* of *Iude*, and *Iames*, he saith, he hath cleared *Luther* aboue. but how hardly, yea not at all, I haue aboue proued out of *Luthers* wordes so clearely, that a blind

Aboue booke 1. chap. 2.

blind man may see it. As for the other bookes vvhich he sayth, *I shall neuer proue to bee Canonicall vnlesse vvee take the canon largelie:* *Bellarmin* hath proued them so euidentlie that I shal not need to take that paines. only I vvill demaund of this audacious Censurer of Canonical bookes vvhy hee refuseth them, rather then th'other bookes? Is it bicause they are cõtrarie to his heresies: then certes, scriptures must bee squared by euery new deuised doctrine, and not doctrines by scriptur: yea so amõgest them they may take awaye all scriptur, if they finde that it stãdeth not vvith their opiniõs. Or is it becaũse these bookes haue not been alwayes receiued of al for Canonical, but haue bene doubted of by some? but vvhy then doth *Luther* reiect Iob & Ecclesiastes? why do some of you call Salomõs cãticles, vnchast & amatorous sõges? for of these there was neuer doubt made in Church of God. as for other bookes as the of *Esther, Baruch, Tobie, Iudith, vvisdõ, Ecclesiasticus*, the first, and second booke of the *Machabees*, the *Epistle* to the *Hebrevves*: *Apocalipse*, and some other partes of scriptur of wch some Catholike vvriters haue somerymes doubted bicause the Church had not then determined that they vvere Canonical: if

Bel. lib. de verbo dei 2. cap. 2.

ex Euseb. lib. 6. c. 24.

Sot. will cal them in question, because once they were not defined, he must cal al scripture in question, because it was scriptur, before is was defined and commonly receued for scriptur, yea if he receue any bookes of scriptur, he must receue these also because the same Roman Church which deliuered those bookes for scriptur hath warranted these also for scriptur, aboue a thousand yeares agone, for *S. Hiero.* & *S. Austin* do reckon vp al these bookes for Canonical scriptur, so doth *Innocentius* the first, ep. 3. so doth the *Councel* of *Laodicea*, *Councel* of *Carthage*, so also doth *Gelasius Pope*, so doe the *Councels of Florence* and *Trent*. yea *Eusebius* out of *Melito* numbreth the bookes of the old testament and the former bookes amongest them, as Canonical and true scriptur.

Hieron. in ep. Gal. & ad Paulin. Aug. l. 2. doctr. Christ. c. 8. Conc. Laodicean. 59. Conc. Carth. 3. c. 47. Gelas. in decreto quod ex tat. To. 2. concil. Conc. Flo. in Instit. Armen. Trid. sess. 4. Euseb. l. 4. c. 25.

2. To the drift of my argument what answereth hee? The argument was this in effect. The Churches authoritie for scriptur, and the number of the bookes of scriptur is one and the same, but the Reformers will not credit the Church for this: *ergo* they credit her not in that: and seing that her authoritie (as aboue in the former chapter is proued) is the only assurance of scriptur, they reiecting that, haue no assurance of

Scriptur. *Sotcliff* answereth thus *vvee take the scriptures, as the Church of Rome her selfe did, from the prophets and Apostles: vvee do also assure our selues that the iudgemēt of the Apostolicke Church is farre to bee præferred before the iudgement of the Apostatical modern Romish Church.* See hovv vvisilie this vvizard answereth. Nether his Church, nor his pastours were extaūt before *Luther*, as aboue I haue proued, & yet hee makes th' Apostles, or *Luther* to haue so lōg armes as though they could reach to *Luther*, who was fifteen hundred yeares after them, or *Luther* to them, vvho vvere fifteen hundred yeares before him, to receue the scriptures from their handes. Or if *Sotcliff* answvere that th' Apostles are yet liuing in heauen, and that from thence they reached him the Bible, he makes them to haue longer armes then eares, bicause he confesseth that they can not heare our prayers so farre of. And he must tell vs also on what Hil in Germany, or on vvhat parte of the Alpes *Luther* receued this lavve: and vvhether he fasted as Moyses 40. dayes in the mountain before he receued the Bible. aboue fol. 421. pag. 2.

3. But peraduentur *Sotcliff* meaneth that his Church and Luther the founder of it, receued the Bible from the Apostles not

immediatelie, but by the Romain Church, or some other Church vvhich receiued it of them. If this be his meaning, then I must tel him that the Romain Church deliuered him *Iob*, *Tobie*, *Iudith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and *Ecclesiastes* the first and second booke of the *Machabees*, the Epistle to the *Hebrevves* and of S. *Iames*, vvhy then vvill they receue some bookes of her not all, her authoritie being the same, and they hauing no knovvledge either of one booke or other but by her. If *Sotcliff* say that his ovvn Church distinct from the Romain Church gaue them iust so many bookes Canonical, and noe more, and that therefore they reiect th'others, hee must name the Church, and tell in vvhat parte of the world it resided, or in what caues or thicketes or wildernesse, it lurked. And vvhe he shall haue told vs a tale of a tubbe, and of a Church that was neuer seen, felt, or hard of: *Luther* him selfe will confesse that he receiued the scriptures from the Romain Church, & could not else haue come by them, yea that for scriptur, thee must be credited. And then I vvill be so bold as to demaund of *Sotcliff*, yea and of *Luther* also, if he vvill conuince him vp vvhy they beleeue the Romain Church for scriptur, and not for the

apud Hosium lib. 3 cõt. Brent. in initio.

meaning, I hee hauing receiued both from the Apostles and primatiue Church: and vvhy and vvith vvhat reason, they receiue some bookes not others? and they can giue me no other answere nor reason, then this, to vvit either bicause these bookes are contrarie to their doctrin, or bicause their spirit iudgeth them not Canonical, or that the phrase seemeth not scripturistical, & so they shall preferre their priuate iudgement before the Councell of Trent, Florence, yea of Carthage and al the Christiã Church, which, (as saint Austin sayth) is meare madnes.

4. Vvheras *Sorcliff* addeth they preferre *the iudgement of th' Apostolical Church, before the iudgemẽt of the Apostatical modern Church*: I must desire him to looke backe to the fifte chapter of my second booke, and there he shall see that I haue proued the Roman Church that novv is to be Apostolical as being descended from that Church by succession, and stil conformable vnto it in doctrine: there also hee shall see most plainlie euen by the confessiõ of his own doctours, that his, Church is no Apostolical, but Apostatical. I must more ouer tell him that not only the Church vvhich was in th' Apostles tyme, but also the Church in al tymes is to

Abg. ep. 118. fol 249.

iudge and determin vvhich are Canonical scriptures, because the Church vvhich once is true is euer true and neuer faileth as aboue I haue proued vvherfore the anciēt Fathers followed the Churches definitiō as an infallible rule in this matter: as *S. Ireneus, S. Hierō, S. Leo, Origen* and others: *S. Austin*, so much relied on the Church euen of his tyme, that he sayed, *he vvould not beleeue the Ghospel if the authoritie of the Church did not moue him.* The first Councel of *Toledo* accurseth al these that admit other scriptures then the Catholique Church doth. And vvhen *Sotcliff* hath refused the modern Romain and Catholique Churches iudgement, vvhat better assuraunce hath he? yea vvhat assuraunce at al hath he vnlesse it bee his own priuat spirit, or *Caluins* or *Besaes* verdit, or the sentence of his own ragged Church, vvhich vvas neuer seen, felt, or heard of before *Luther*, and vvhich also aggreeth in few Canonical bookes: for as Luther reiected *S. Iames* his *Epistle*, *Calum* admitteth it, so some of them receue some bookes vvhich others do not?

Iren lib 3. cap. 1 34. Hieron. de expos. Symb. ad Damas. Leo. 1. ep. 40. ad Martian. Orig. apud Eus. l 6. cap 12. Aug. libr. cont. ep. fund. ca. 5. & lib. 19. cont. Faustum ca 4. 4. Conc. Tol. 1. can. 21.

5. He answereth that *besides the testimonie of any one particular Church they haue diuers argumētes to assure them of th'authoritie and truth and number of Canonical bookes.* And vvhat argu-

mentes are those? *The testimonie of scriptur it selfe* (sayth he) *the likenes, maiestie, antiquitie, truth, stile of scriptur and such like.* O the dowtie argumētes. but as for the first vvhere do you read in scriptur that these and so many and noe more nor lesse nor others, are Canonical bookes? And if scripture did giue testimonie of her selfe, yet as a man may doubt of scriptur vnles he hath some assuraunce: so might he doubt of this testimonie vvhether that bee scriptur, and not rather a forged testimonie inserted by the authour to procure credit to this booke? As for the *likenes, maiestie,* antiquitie, truth & stile: they are so obscure & deceitfull markes of scriptur, that God had il prouided for his Church if he had left noe other assuraunce. for how absurd had it been for God to deliuer his mynde vnto vs in the booke of scriptur, and so to tye our saluation ther vnto, that vvee should not bee saued vvithout beleefe of he mysteries therin conteined, and yet to leue it to euerie ons imagination to iudge what bookes are scripture by the *likenes, maiese, antiquitie, truth and stile?* And as for the truth, in that our minister especiallie shewe his wit. for if I aske him hovv he knowet God to be Incarnate, Christe to haue

dyed and risen again he vvill answvere because scriptur, sayth so: and if I aske again hovv he knovveth the bookes that say so to bee scriptur, he vvil answvere bicause it is a truth that God is Incarnate, that Christe dyed and rose again: and so like a blind milhorse he will runne him selfe giddie in a Circle.

6. But notwithstanding that these markes of *Sotcliff* are absurdes marke yet they are as good as Caluin him selfe giueth. for he hauing reiected the authoritie of the Catholique Romain Church, vvhich vvas vvont to bee credited for the knovvledge of scriptur, deeming it absurd that scriptur should depend on men (vvhich is true, if scriptur so depended on men as that of them it receued truth and authoritie for it selfe, but it is not absurd that in respect of vs, vvho can not know vvhich is scriptur but by the voice of the Church, that scriptur should depend of her in respect of vs shee being directed by the spirit of Christ, as Christ did of *S. Ihon Baptistes* and the *Apostles* testimnie) sayth that *Some vvill demaund vvho shal certifie vs that this doctrin is proceeded from God, that it is come to our tyme vvhol and intiere: he shal perswade vs to receiue one booke rather then*

Calu. li. 1. Inst. ca. 7. § 1.

another, if the Church did not giue an infallible rule. And although these demaundes bee reasonable yet *Caluin* sayth they *are not vvithout mockerie of the holy Ghost*. and he calleth them *canailles* for making such demaundes. But seing that it is necessarie (as *Caluin* in the beginning of that chapter cõfesseth) to know assuredly the bookes of scriptur, our faith depending theron, I desire him in good sadnes to tell vs what meanes we haue to know scriptur, after vvee haue reiected the Churches authoritie? he answereth, but yet in great choller, as they commonly do that can not tell vvhat to answvere. *Quant a ce que ces canailles demandent, &c. Touching that vvhich these knaues demaund, how wee shal be perswaded that the scriptur is proceeded from God, if wee haue not recourse to the decree of the Church: it is as if one should demaund hovv vvee should learn to discerne betvvixt light and darkenes, black and white, sweete and bitter.* But if this bee so cleare and euident a thing, hovv commeth it passe that there is such contention betvvixt vs and them, and their consortes, about the number of Canonical bookes? If it bee so cleare that these bookes are Canonical and no others: I demaund to vvhom it is thus cleare? Is it euident to all as vvel faithles as

faithfull? how then comes it to passe that infidels receue not our scripturs for Gods word. Is it euident to the faithfull only? Then by faith only; and so vvee can not learne faith of scriptur (contrarie to Caluin in the same place) bicause if by faith vvee learn to discern scriptures, wee haue faith before wee knovv scriptures. And hovv then can *Sotcl.* or *Caluin* induce infidels to receue scriptur, they hauing no faith. I demaūd also, vvhom *Caluin* comprehendeth vnder the name of faithfull? If al these that professe them selues Christians? then he must tel mee vvhy they then amongest them selues are at daggers drawing about Canonical bookes? If *Caluinistes* only; the *Lutherans* will except against this exception, saying that they see clearlie that *S. Iames* his *Epistle* is not Canonical, which yet *Caluin* holdeth for Canonical, and who then shal take vp the matter?

7. Vherfore *Caluin* not daring to stand to this clearnes of Scripture vvhich is against all experience, hee saith that the *verie Maiestie of Scriptur*, conuinceth it to be the vvord of God: but if yee say that this maiestie is not so euident, the stile of scriptur being diuers, and many tymes also verie humble: he hath yet a nother assurance. And vvhat is that?

lib. 1. ca. 8. §. 1. 2.

In one vvorde saith hee *it is the Spirit*. But I hauing reiected this Spirit aboue in the *first booke* and *second chapter*, as also in this present booke and former chapter, hence can bee had no assuraunce: bicause no man is sure of his ovvn Spirit much lesse of an other mans: and vvee see the *Lutherianes* by the Spirit haue discanonised bookes vvhich *Caluin* admitteth to the *Canon*, and *Suencfeldius* by his spirit reiected al Scriptur, as also did the *Libertines*. If Caluin answer, as he doth *li. 1. Inst. c. 9. §. 2.* that Spirits must be tryed by Scriptur, he runneth into a Circle out of vvhich he shal neuer escape vvith honour, becaus euen now he tryed Scriptur by the Spirit, and novv again he trieth the Spirit by Scriptur. Vvherfore *Brentius* seing, that by none of al these meanes he can haue any assuraunce of Scriptur, confesseth that vve must acertain our selues by *Tradition*. But then hence it followveth that al thinges necessarie to bee beleeued are not in Scriptur. Bicause it is necessarie to Saluation, to beleeue that the fovvr Ghospelles and other bookes are the vvord of God, vvhich yet *Brentius* confesseth can not be knovvn by *Scriptur*, but by *Tradition*. Again this Tradition of Scriptur from the Apostles vvas ne-

Calu. lib. 1. c. 6. §. 4. & c. 7. §. 4. &

ex Caluino in Instruct. aduersus libertinos cap. 9.

Brent. in praefat. Apolog. confess. vviutemb.

ner kept in any other Church then the Catholike Romain Church, but shee (as you say) hath deliuered you many vntruths how then can you thinke that shee hath not foisted *Apocryphal* bookes into the *Canon* and corrupted others, but hath deliuered the entirely vnto you? And if you beleeue her not, for the number of bookes, you can not credit her for Scriptur at al. And so hauing left the *Romain* Church you haue no probable assurance either of Scriptur or the number of the bookes of Scriptur. And hauing thus brought Scriptur into doubt and question, you giue men iust occasion to doubt of the contentes of Scriptur, and consequently of al mysteries of faith: which (as aboue I haue told you) is the right vvay to Atheism and contempt of al Religion.

## The somme of the fifte chapter.

THe dissensions and garboiles of the reformers in matters of Religion, which are aboue related, giue iust occasion of Atheisme and contempt of al Religion, to him that hath alreadie contemned the Catholike Romain Church, for thus hee may discourse vvith himselfe. I see (sayth he or at least may saye) diuers sectes and Sinagogues, diuers

aboue booke 2. chap. 6.

faithes and Religions, diuers congregations and conuenticles. And some are called Lutherans, some Zuinglians, some Caluinistes, some Bezites, some Protestantes, some Puritans, some Anabaptistes and Libertines, and some by other names: and though all these differ in pointes of faith and one frō an other, and cōdemne the others as heretikes, yet they all vse the same proofe for their contrarie opinions, to vvit Scripture sensed by their priuat spirit. So that if I will bee of any of these Religions I must bee of all, they al vsing the same meanes to perswade mee. but of al I can not bee, they being contrarie and contradictorie, vvherfore I choose rather and vvith more reason also to bee of none of them: and so being perswaded by them al not to bee of the Catholike Romain Religion, I vvill be nether Papist nor Protestant nor Puritan nor Zuinglian, but rather an Atheist or Machiuillian, that is of no Religion.

## Iotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.

SOtcliff hauing pronounced *Anathema*, and *Maranatha*, against the damned crevv, the *Anabaptists*, *Libertines*, and the *familie of loue*, the *Brovvnists*, and *Martinistes* (vvho yet vsed the same proofe for their Religion vvhich the *Lutheranes* and *Caluinists* doe, to vvit scri-

ptur ſenſed by their priuat Spirit) ſaith that the Churches of Germany, Fraunce, and other countries do wel agree: and ſo my argument grounded in their diſſenſions concludeth not. but I hauing ſhewed aboue by nine argumentes, that they do al differ in capital matters of faith and religion, my concluſion ſtandeth ſtill in force, till a better answer commeth.

aboue booke 1. chap. 6.

## The ſomme of the ſixt chapter.

*IN the newe Church there is no viſible head as aboue in the firſt booke and ſixt chapter is proued, and conſequentlie nothing is left to determin controuerſies in religion but ſcriptur and the priuat ſpirit: which being obſcure and uncertain, may dee alleaged by al heretikes, as in the 2. and 3. chapter of the firſt booke is proued: and ſo he that reiecteth the viſible head of the Romain Church hath no reaſon to bee rather of one religiō then another, becauſe all alleage the ſame autoritie to their ſcriptur, interpreted by their priuat ſpirites: and ſeing that he hath no reaſon to bee of al Religions, hee may reſolue iuſtly to bee of noe religion.*

### *Sotcliffes answer with the Refutation.*

AS though (ſayth he) *general and prouincial Counſels and Biſhops in their Dioceſes,*

*and Godlie Princes in their Kingdomes were not able to remedie that disorder.* And thus he thinketh to haue answered wiselie. But first herein he contradicteth him selfe, vvhoe pag. 2. & 15. counteth it absurd that fayth should depend of men. Secondlie he contradicteth al the Doctours of his Church; for *Luther* reiecteth al Fathers and Councels as aboue vvee haue seene, and pronounceth boldly, *nihil recipimus nisi scripturam, vvee receue nothing but scripture.* And so nether Councels nor Princes are to be iudges in controuersies of faith. And according to this *Calain* vvill examin al Councels by the rule of the vvord: yea vvhen they are vrged ether by Fathers or Councels, they say they receiue them as farre as they aggree vvith the word. So *Sorelius* him selfe sayth in this his *Reuevv and examination, pag. 26. lin.* 1. and in the same plate *lin.* 12. he sayth *their faith is built only on the word.* Vvhy then doth he build it on his Councels or Prince? Thirdly I haue aboue in the sixt chapter of the first booke reiected his national and prouincial Councel as an vnlavvfull, his General Councel as vnlavvfull and impossible: & I haue proued aboue that y^t Prince is noe iudge in matters of Religiō. lastlie he admitteth not ether Prouin-

Luth. li de seruo arb. aboue fol. 37. pa. 2.

cial or General Counſel abſolutlie, but only as farre as it proceedeth according to Gods vvord, and ſo the Counſel is not iudge but ſome other that iudgeth vvhen the Counſel proceedeth ſo. And ſo ſet in his Church having no lawfull viſible iudge to expound ſcriptures and determin controuerſies (to vvhich our faith is ſubiect by reaſon of the obſcuritie of it and Scripture) hee and euerie one in his Church may beleeue vvhat they liſte and no man ſhal controlle them, for then nothing remaineth to compoſe ſtrifes and controuerſies, but ſcripture, and the priuat ſpirit vvhich haue euer ſerued to countenance vvhat ſoeuer hereſie. And ſeing that a man hath no reaſon to bee of al religions, & yet, after hee hath reiected a viſible head, hath no more reaſon to bee of one then another religion, becauſe they all are proued by ſcripture, vvithout a lavvful iudges interpretation, hee may iuſtly refuſe to bee of any Religion.

## The ſomme of the ſeuenth chapter.

*Sacrifice highly pleaſeth God: obedience is more pleaſing becauſe it is a Sacrifice of the vvill, and thus obedience then hath the total complement vvhen*

vvhen by the ayd of faith it makes not only the vvill, but also the vnderstanding to stoop and to yeeld to matters of faith for vvhich ther is no reason, bicause they are aboue reason. Amongest th' articles of faith in vvhich especially this obedience is tryed, three are the most principal and vvhich seem most impossible. To vvit the high and hidden mysteries of the Trinitie in vvhich three persons are one God, nature and substaunce: The Incarnation in vvhich two nature are one person: The Eucharist in vvhich bread is turned into Christes body, vvhich also being but one is in diuers places. Vvherfore in these darke mysteries and mazes many curious vvittes haue lost them selues, yet God hath so prouided that these mysteries are in plain termes set dovvn in scriptur, though not so plainly, but that a man that vvill vvade into them vvithout a vuide may fall into the depthes of errour. None of these mysteries is more plainly set dovvn in scriptures then the Eucharist, in vvhich Christe promised to giue his body and bloud: and at his last supper auouched also that he gaue it to his Apostles saying this is my body. The circumstaunces of the place do argue that Christe spake properlie, and reallie, not figuratiuely: for in the sixt of S. Ihon vvhen he made the promise he preferreth the bread of life, vvhich he promiseth and vvhich hee calleth his flesh, and true meate, before manna: vvhich ar- Io. 6. Mat. 16.

gueth that the Eucharist conteyneth Christ reallie, else it had not been better then manna, which also signifyed Christ and being a figure of him, conteined him figuratiuelie nether could giue life more then manna yea else mãna had excelled the Eucharist as is proued. Besides this, Christe so often threatening that vnlesse vvee eate his flesh, & drinke his bloud, and neuer explicating him selfe though hee savv many vvere scandalized, argueth, that he meãt to giue, his body reallie and that they also understood him reallie else vvith one vvord, Christ might haue taken avvay the scandale, if he had meant only to giue his body in a figur as Zuinglius saith, or by faith only, as Caluin saith for the Ievves vvere vsed to figures, and had eaten Christe in figure and by faith, in manna, the Paschal lamb, and many other figures. And yet Christe neuer would giue them this so easie an exposiũ of his vvordes: only bicause the Capharnaites magined that they should eate Christe in that grosse mãner as they do meate frõ the shambles, Christe told them that the spirit viuificateth the flesh profiteth nothing, that is a spiritual not carnal vnderstãding of these vvordes, as S. Austin expounAugust in eum locũ trac 27. in Ioan. deth. But yet Christe meant still a real mãducation though in a sacramental manner, bicause if he had meant only eating in a figure or by faith, he vvould certainly so haue explicated, knovving that so he

should by and by haue taken away the scandal. Lastlie to induce them to the beliefe of this mysterie; Christe (as S. Chrysostom noteth hom. 45. in Ioan.) wrought that miracle of feeding so many with so litle bread: yea (as S. Cirill lib. 4. in ca. 2. vi Ioan. sayth) for that cause also he mentioned his ascension into heauen: which no doubt was to induce them to the beleefe of a great mysterie, and had been ridiculous if he had meant only figuratiue eating, or eating by faith that hauing been made easie by custome to the Iewes. In the places likewise where Christe professed to giue his body & bloud he saith in expresse termes this is my body, this is my bloud, and that he spake properly and not figuratiuelie, it is plain, because then he instituted a Sacrament: then he made a lawe: then he made his last will and Testament: at which tymes men doe, and ought to speake plainlie: then he spake to his Apostles to whom he vsed not to speake in parables as he did to the people: or when he did speake in figures or parables, they demaunded of him the explication of it, which yet here they did not: yea none of the Euangelistes, no not so much as S. Paule, who wrote after them, did euer explicate otherwise these wordes, notwithstanding that the wordes being plain, and the circumstances so concurring, it had been an easie thing to cause a great errour in the world, as it hath, if the

Math 26. Mar. 14. Luc. 22. Io. 6. Mat. 13. Mar. 4. Io. 16.

real præsence bee an errour: then also Christe lifted vp his eyes and blessed the bread and wine, which when he did, some reall mutation followed: then also hauing sayd this is my bodie, this is my bloud, he added, which is giuen for you, which is shed for you, *as the greeke importeth:* which can not be verified of bread and wine. If not withstanding plain text, and so many circumstaunces, wee deny the real præsence, and expound the wordes figuratiuelie and spirituallie, then may wee doe so in th' other mysteries of the Trinitie, Incarnation, and Resurrection, and so shall haue no certaintie of any mysterie. The Fathers also who are the interpreters of scriptures, vnderstand the former wordes in a propre and real sense, and do as plainly pronounce of Christes bodie in the Sacrament as of any article of faith: for some of the affirme as plainly as the scripture that the Eucharist is Christes bodie and his bloud, as Ignatius to whom I might haue added Martialis, Clemens, Iustinus, Ireneus, Tertulian, S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, S. Austin, and infinit others. other fathers say that th' Eucharist is not a bare signe or figure but the body of Christe, vnited to vs realie and not only by faith as S. Chrysostom ho. 60. and 61. ad Pop. Theophilact vppon the 6. chapter of S. Ihon vppon the 14. chap. of S. Marke and 26. chap. of S. Mathew. S. Hilary lib. 8. Trin. S.

Ign. ep ad Rom.
Mart. ep. ad Burdeg. cap. 3.
Clem. l. 2. const. cap. 24. Iust. Apol. 2.
Iren. l. 5. c. 2. Tert. ll. de orat. sub finem
Cip. lib. 2. ep 3. Amb. l. 4. de Sac. c. 4. 5 Aug. l. 3. Trinit. cap. 4.

Cirill of Hierusalem Catech: 4. mystag. Cirillus Alexandrinus, l. 10. in Io. c. 13. Other fathers admire how Christes bodie at the same tyme is in heauen and in earth as S. Chrysostome and Gregorius Nissenus, S. Basil, and others which argueth that they thought Christes bodie to bee reallie in the B. Sacrament, else, that Christes bodie is in heauē reallie, and in the Sacramēt figuratiuelie: and as in a signe is no greater miracle then that the vvine at the same tyme is reallie in the Seller, and in the Iuybush as in a signe, or that the King is at the same tyme in his chamber of presence reallie, and yet in as many other places figuratiuelie as there are pictures of him. So S. Austin, vvondereth how Christe at his last supper caryed him selfe in his own handes, meaning reallie, else it had been no greater mysterie, then vvhen the King holdeth his own pictur in his handes. Other Fathers as S. Ireneus, Cirillus, S. Ambrose, compare the mutation of bread and vvine into the body and bloud of Christe vvith real and straunge conuersions or operations: as creation, Incarnation, Natiuitie of Christe, cōuersion of the rod into a serpent, the rock into vvater, vvater into blood, vvater into vvine &c. vvhich yet (if bread bee only made a figure of Christes body and not trulie turned into it) were as fondly done, as if they compared an Iuibush vnto the same mutations, when by hanging it before the

Chrysost. ho. 1. ad Pop. & li. 3. de sacer. Greg. nis. orat. de Paschate. Basil in liturg.

Aug. 86c. 2. in Psal. 33.

Iren. l. 3. cap. 12. & 4. c. 34. Ciril. Catech. 4. Myst. Ambr. lib. de iis qui initiantur. cap. 9.

Cypr. ser. de Cœna Dom. Ambr. supra. Damascen. lib. 4. cap 14.

Tauern, of noe sign it is made a signe. Other Fathers as S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, and others to explicate how bread is made Christes bodie do runn to Gods omnipotencie, which were ridiculous, if bread were only made a signe of Christes bodie, for without omnipotencie wee see such mutations daylie wrought, as when an Inbush of no signe is made a signe. Other Fathers as S. Chrysostom admire heare Christes charitie that he would feed vs with his own flesh, and not only leaue his cloke with vs as Helias did with Helizeus, but his own selfe. And yet if he had left vs only a sign of him selfe, the charitie and frendship had been no more then when a freind at his departur leaueth his pictur for a remembraunce. others as S. Andrew, and S. Cyprian, and many more admire how Christ being eaten of vs is not yet cōsumd, which yet if Christe be not reallie in the Sacrimēt is no more to be merualled at, then that the kinges pictur should be broken and eaten in past and he receue no harme: Or that the Iewes did eate the Paschal lamb and in it receued Christe not reallie but by faith only, and yet did not hurt Christe: for faith hath noe teeth. I might add how other Fathers bid vs not to trust our senses, though by them wee iudge it to be bread and wine, but to trust rather Christes wordes and faith by which wee are told that it is Christes body and bloud. So say

Chrys. ho. 83 in Mat. ho. 60. ad Pop. ho. 45. in Ioa. hom. 2. ad Pop.

Ande in vita apud Sur. Cypr. ser. de cœna. Aug. hom. 1. de verb. Apost. Cyril. Catech. 5. mystag.

S. Ciril, of Hierusalē S. Hilary, and S. Chrysostom, and Theophilact: yet they saye that Christes bodie & bloud are giuen vs vnder the formes of bread and wine to hide the maiestie of Christe and least wee should abhorre to eate his flesh & drinke his bloud in there proper forme. so say S. Ambrose, S. Damascene, Theophilact, Cirillus Alexandrinus: vvhich vvere ridiculously sayed if the Eucharist vvere bread and vvine and only a signe of Christes body and bloud. Hence I deduce this Argument. The same authoritie deserues still the same credit, but there is as good authoritie for the real presence of Christes sacred body and bloud in the B. Sacrament as for the Trinitie, Incarnation, or any other mysterie of faith ergo this can not bee denyed, but al the other articles of faith are brought inquestion. That there is as good authoritie for this as for these articles I haue proued, bicause the wordes of scriptur are most plain, the circumstaunces concur, the interpretours do al conspire in this matter and in as plain termes as in any other mysterie, I could adde the cōsent of the Christiā world, the practise of the Church, the definition of Councels. And if notwithstāding al this authoritie wee discredit the real presence, wee are not to giue credit to any other article of faith, ther being no more authoritie for them then this. And so the denyal of the real presence shaketh all the articles of Chri-

Ciril. Catech. 4. myst. Hil. li. 8. Trin. Chrys. ho. 83. in mat. Ambr. lib. 4. cap. 4. Dama. lib. 4 cap 14. Theophi. in cap. 26. Math. & 14. Marci. ciril. Al. 12. apud D. Th. in Catena in ca. 22. Lucæ.

*stian faith vvhence followeth also contempt of al Religion.*

*Sotcliffes answer vvith the Refutation.*

AS if he lay gasping the last gaspe, he answereth nothing to this chapter nether to my argumentes out of scriptur and fathers: only (vvhich is an old fault of his) he denyeth the conclusion: saying that, *not those that deny the Ciclopical eating of Christes flesh and the carnal presence* (so he termeth the real præsence but absurdly as aboue I haue told him) *but such rather as hold that Christes flesh and bloud is receaued of reprobate persons, nay hogges and dogges &c. do cal al holy mysteries in question.* As for the twoe places of scriptures by mee alleaged *Io. 6.* and *Mat. 26.* he sayth he hath declared in his booke *de Missa* against *Bellarmin*, that *they are not to the Purpose* vvhich his booke he so liketh and loueth (but vvithout a riual, for noe man makes loue to it but him selfe) that he sayth, in it al *the cauillations of his aduersaries are particularly discussed and so stand for any thing ether the doughty Doctor of Douvvay or Bellarmin can say against vs.* vvhich yet I can not beleeue, if I may iudge of a Lion by his pawes, or of that his booke by this and others vvhich I haue seen. then he noteth an absurditie by me

committed in præferring obedience before sacrifice, for that, *speaking* (as he sayth) *of Papish sacrifices*, I say, that *by sacrifice vvee consecrate to God his seruice the liues and substaunce of brute beastes, but by obediēce vvee make a burnt offring and holocaust of our own soules, yea vvilles and selues.* But the same manner of speech S. *Gregorie* vseth in these vvordes, *obedientia quippe victimas iure præponitur, quia per victimas aliena caro, per obedientiā vero voluntas propria mactatur:* obediēce is worthilie preferred before sacrifices, bicause by sacrifices the flesh of others (to vvit brute beastes) by obedience our ovvn vvill is sacrificed, vvhere hee alludeth to the sacrifices of the old lavv (of wch also Sauls vvordes, 1. *Reg.* 15. vvhich gaue *S. Gregorie* th'occasion, are vnderstood) and so did I not to any Popish sacrifices, vvel knovving that vvee sacrifice now no brute beastes, but the *reasonable sacrifice* Christe his own selfe.

li. 35. mor. cap. 13. ad cap. 14. Iob. & ca. sciendum. 8. q. 1.

After this vveake answver giuen to so strong argumentes as vvere framed out of Scriptures and fathers for the B. Sacrament, *Sotcliff* addeth, an *Appendix* to his answver to this booke: by vvhich he goeth about to proue that the doctrin also of Catholiques openeth the gap to Atheism and contempt

of Religion. But when he comes to his proofe, he bringes in his ordinarie Authors who write of the euil manners of Rome, and other places in the Church of God, and haue diuers false Reportes of some Popes liues: But this is no suruey of doctrine, which should haue answered to my Suruey: and to this aboue he is answered. Wherfore at length he saith that *the very doctrin of Popery tendeth to Atheisme.* And why? bicause saith he *they beleeue as the Church beleeueth:* ô Atheisme. he addeth that wee make many Goddes in worshipping Saintes, the Sacrament, Images, and so haue no God. that wee speake lewdly of Scriptures, that wee impugn the first cõmaundement in honouring Saintes and Images, the secõd in teaching as the Rhemists do, to breake oathes, the other in rebelling against Kinges excõmunicated by the Pope, in promising heauẽ to thẽ that murder Princes: in permitting stewes in Rome, in calling the Pope God. *cap. Sata. dist. 96.* In renewing old heresies and such like stuffe he addeth, which either is allready answered or not worthy answering. And therfore I hope the Reader will bee so farre from misliking mee for not answering thẽ, that he will meruail how hether to I haue

had the patience, to answer particularely to so many of his fooleries.

Now where as he concludeth that the professors of his Church are innocent and free from the impurations wherwith I had charged them, and then maketh a prayer against Antichrist: and aduertiseth the Reader also that bicause *B. Iewel* and others by their moderate stile haue confirmed Papists in their mallice, that hence forth, they must looke for such a *tart stile* and byting, as he hath vsed against mee: I conclude in this manner. By my Surucy, and this Reply which hath confirmed the Surucy, it is euident to bee seen, that this new Church and Religion established in Inglād, can not bee that which Christ and his Apostles planted, it hauing no other groundes then ancient heresies haue had as is proued in the first booke: it being grimed with al the markes of heresie as the first booke hath shewed: it being iniurious to al the honourable Titles of Christe as the third booke conuinceth: it hauing noe essential parte of Religion as the fourth booke maketh euident: it being blasphemous against God as the fifte booke demonstrateth: it being Iniurious to Princes, their lawes and Tribunals as the

sixt booke hath verified: it opening the gapp to al vice and contempt of Religion as the seuenth and eight bookes haue remonstrated: And seing that this is so euidently proued against this newe Religion, that it can not bee denied by any man of iudgemēt deuoid of Passion, vnlesse first the Principles of the newe Religion bee denyed: I beseech all indifferent Readers to vvay and ponder these thinges seriously: and to remember that it is a matter of as great importaunce as is eternal saluatiō, vvhich can not bee found in a false Church nor purchased by a false faith and Religion, as in the fourth chapter of the 2. booke, and the last chapter of the last booke and last Edition of my Surucy is proued. And you Sir Deane, vvho haue so often blasphemed against God, his Sacramentes, Saintes, and Religion, vvho haue seen that nether your Church nor Religion nor ministerie can bee vpholden, ether by Scriptures, reason, or fathers: vvho haue tried hovv impossible it is to answer myarguementes vnles you first deny your ovvn Principles: who haue seen the euidence vvch I haue brought for the Catholique Churche and faith, runn not headlong, ledde by passion, or ambition, or ignoraunce, or al

three as hetherto you haue done: it is humain imbecillitie to erre, but brutiſh obſtinacie to perſiſt in errours refuted, againſt the trueth vvhich is conuinced. forſake then your errours and imbrace the Catholike faith, cry God mercie for your former blaſphemies, & cal for grace for future faith and amendment of manners. As for your calumnies, and iniurious ſpeches and lyes alſo, vvherwith you endeuoured to diſgrace mee, bicauſe you could not diſgrace the Catholike cauſe vvhich I ſuſteined: I may truly ſay vnto you, that as arrovves ſhott vpvvardes ſeeme to threaten the heauens but come not neere thē, ſo your iniurious ſpeeches vvherwith you thought to ouerwhelme mee, neuer touched mee, bicauſe I neuer apprehend hurt proceeding from that mouth vvhoſe wordes are no ſlaunder. But vvhatſoeuer your fault might bee heerin, I forgiue you hartilie: & deſireth' Almightie to illuminate your vnderſtanding to ſee the truth, to bend your vvill to imbrace the truth, and to giue you of his grace to reforme your manners and to direct your life according to this truth.

FINIS.

# THE TABLE.


Absurdities that followv of the vbiquetaries heresie fol. 226.

Absurdities that followv of imputatiue iustice. 239.

Absurd opinions of Protestants concerninge iustification. 237.

Africa, and Asia after theair breach from the Romaine Church reputed schismatiques. 119.

Arrians, called Catholikes Romanes and Romanistas novv heretikes doe. 110.

Arrians might aswell complaine of theair punishment by Constantine and the Nicene councell as Protestants novv doe. 183.

Apostolicall traditions allovved by the Church denied by the Gnostikes: 181.

Authoritie Ecclesiasticall in England deriued all frome the Prince and Parlament. 32.

Appeales made to the Pope in the primitiue Church. 174.

Athanasius and Peter of Alexandria fled to the Church of Rome against the Arrians. 119.

Æquiuocation proued sometimes lavvful. 202.

Æquiuocatiõ may not bee vsed before a lavvfull iudge proceeding iuridically, nor in matters of faith before an vnlavvfull. 205.

Ærius an heretike by Epiphanius and S. Augustine for denying prayers and oblations for the dead. 337.

B.

BAptisme maketh euery man subiect to the Church and therfore punishable. 186.
Baptisme needlesse to children by Caluines doctrine. 344.
Baptisme though it be not giuen in the name of the Trinitie is good by Luther. 345.
Baptisme may bee giuen in any naturall vvater though it bee not cleane. 345.
Baptisme proued necessarie to children and therfore vvoemen in case of necessitie must baptise. 347.
Bishops and vvhat are their vvorkes. 22. only Bishops ordaine inferior Ministers. 33.
Bishops must bee consecrated by other Bishops and not by inferiour Ministers. 34.
Bishops are not to bee consecrated nor made by the people. 35.
English Bishops consecrated at the chapple of the nagges heade. 31.
Badge of an heretike to deny Traditions. 182.
S. Basil rebuketh the Emperours cooke for talkinge of diuine matters. 195.
Bare letter of scripture noe perfect triall vvhat the Apostles taught. 195.
Badge of an heretike to deny traditions. 182.
Blasphemie against Christ to say he can not cure the reliques of Sinne. 257.
Beguards & Beguines exempt the faithfull from all humaine lavves. 140. See Lutherans. ibid.
Beza, Iewell, Fox, and Sotclife most impudently deny dissentions in matters of faith in the reformed Churches. 151.

Breakinge forth of the Romaine Church is the marke of an heretike and of the Protestants. 85.
Bellarmine defended against Sotcliffe. 85.
Bibles English reiected in the conference at Hampton court. 86.
on Body may bee in diuers places. 319.
A Body may come to a place and leaue it vvithout local motion. 327.

C.

IN the Catholike Church noe dissentions in faith, in the hereticall noe agreement. 151.
Catholikes forbid noe meat as euil, but commande abstinence as good. 97.
Catholikes forbid Symonie, seuearly alsoe punish it. 111.
Catholikes defended from the heresie of the Carpocratians. 114.
Catholiques defended from the heresie of the Marcionistes. 117.
Catholikes defended from the heresies of the Valentinians and Manichies. 119.
Catholiques fallsly acused to fly the Scriptures. 177.
Catholikes in the primitiue Church erected churches in honour of Saintes. 289.
Catholikes belyed by Sotcliff to rebaptise those that are rightly baptised in England. 343.
Catholikes doctrine is not to bee measured, by the liues of Catholikes. 413.
Caluin and Luther make Christ ignorant vvith the Agonites. 140.
Caluinists vvith Nouatians and Donatists despise Chrisme and Confirmation. 140.

Caluin

Caluins Liturgies full of sacriledge as Illyricus affirmeth. 147.
Caluinists call Lutherans Idolaters. 155.
Caluin giueth Seruetus groundes of his heresie. 119.
Caluin vvill bee iudge of all councells and decrees. 215.
Caluin makes Christ à mediator before Adam according to his diuinitie and is proued a flatt Arrian. 214.
Caluin, Iewel, Whitaker iustly charged vvith heresie about the Trinitie. 329.
Caluin saith that the good vvorkes of the faithfull are sinnes. 239.
Caluin proued to say that Christ despayred. 277.
Caluin saith Christ suffered the paines of the damned. 279.
Caluin saith the Fathers abuse that place *Ego & Pater vnum sumus* to proue Christ consubstantiall to his father. 235.
Caluin and Luther iustly accused for denyinge Hell. 280.
Caluin had noe lavvfull mission. 33.
Caluin defendeth the Church to haue falne and fayled. 40. 41. He vrgeth lavvfull missiõ against his fellovv heretikes. 43. Reiecteth fathers. 61. Reiecteth Councels. 76. Defendeth that heretikes haue noe scripture. 48.
Caluin and Luther take aWaye consultations and deliberations. 398.
Tovv places of the Canon explicated. 328.
Canon lavv punisheth noe hereticke vvith death. 187.

Chastitie of Priests most conuenient for many causes. 95.
Chastitie commaunded in the Nicene councell, and proued in the primitiue Church. 96.
Candells and lightes allovved by S. Hierom at midday. 134.
Christs Church spread ouer all nations and euer eminent. 168.
Christs Passion not the formal cause of iustification but the meritorious cause. 246.
Christ proued no Redeemer by protestants doctrine. 245. & seq.
Christ no lavv giuer acording to Luther and Caluin. 260.
Christ no æternal Preist by the sacrifice of the crosse, but of the Eucharist. 267.
Christ no iudge of the quick and the dead by Protestants doctrine. 268. & seq.
Christs crosse honored and vvhy. 285.
Christ his body and blood truly sacrificed in the Sacrament. 26. For the quick and the dead. 28.
Christ in respect of his humaine nature may bee called à creature. 303.
Christ had nether faith nor hope becavse he had the cleare vision of God. 306.
Christ suffered extreme sorovv and yet vvas in great joy at the same instant by diuers obiects and respects. 308.
Christ as man knovveth all thinges past, present and to come. but not all thinges possible. 309.
Christs death by sundry respects vvas voluntarie, and necessarie, naturall and miraculous. 310.
Christ as comprehensor did not merit, as viator

he did. 311.
Christ repleniſhed vvith all knovvledge, and merited from his conception. 311.
Christ ſole mediator of our redemption, Saincts ſecundary mediators of interceſſion. 312.
Christ not man in the three days of his death. 330.
Christ body in the Sacrament, though it loſe not naturall being yet it loſeth Sacramentall. 315.
Christs body may bee really preſent and yet not viſible. 318.
Christ could not ſinne. 304.
Christs ſupreame headſhip taketh not avvay other inferior heades. 330.
Christ had not been prouident for his Church if he had left noe iudge but ſcripture. 331.
Church can not erre. 82.
Vvhat is meant by *die Eccleſie*, complayne to the Church. 20.
Church muſt haue à viſible head. 71. Shall neuer vvant lavvfull miniſters. 36. Vvhear and hovv it erred in the heretikes opinion. 40. Luthers vvas inuiſible or did erre euen in Sotcliff and his brethrens opinion. 41. 42.
Church alvvais eminent & ouer al nations ſpread. 168.
Churches erected in the honor of Saintes in the primitiue Church. 289.
Canus defended againſt Sotcliff. 48.
Cardinalls hovv ancient and in vvhat ſenſe. 24.
Ceadvvall and Offa, Kinges of Saxons vvent to Rome to viſit the Apoſtles tombes. 291.
S. Chriſoſtomes and S. Auguſtines deuotions to Reliques. 293.

Cranmer Was a true Bishop but noe lavvfull Arch-bishop. 30. He had noe commission to preach heresie in King Edvvards dayes. 30. He vvas the first hereticall Arch-bishop of England. 31.
Crosse honored and vvhy. 285.
Communion booke reiected by a 1000. Ministers. 86.
Councels relied not only vpon scripture. 48.
Councels general by Sorcl. are not supreme Iudges in controuersies. 77. Nether nationall. 78.

D.

Deniall of the Popes authoritie, speciall faith, and beleeuing the Trinitie make a perfect Protestant. 161.
Deniall of doctrine noe marke of an heretik. 100
Definitions of the Pope and Councell not to be examined and vvhy. 211.
Diuines affirme against Durand, that if Christ had taken our nature without cleare vision of God, yet he could not haue sinned. 304.
Diuels cary thear Hell about them. 304.
Dissentions in faith proued amongest Ghospellers. 153.
Dilemma inuincible against Sorcliffes mission. 33
Another against the same. 43.
Difference betvvixt naturall, volontary, and *Spontaneum*. 359.
Donatists proued heretikes by S. Augustine because thear Church vvas not vniuersall. 170.
Donatists, Huss, and Luther, held that heretikes might not be punished. 185.
Drinke yea all of this, noe generall commaunde-

ment to all People. 189.
Durand falsey alleaged by Sotcliff. 303.

E.

EMperours and Ancient Fathers vvou'd not permit things defined in councels to be disputed vpon. 214.
Englisſh Biſhops vvear not truly ordeined, in King Edvvard the 6. dayes. 31.
Exhortation to Englād to leaue the nevv Church and adhere to the old. 156.
An Exhortation to the truthe. 439.
Euchariſt à bare figure to ſtirr vp faith, by Caluin. 344.

F.

FAthers compare the mutations of bread in the Euchariſt vvith the reſurrection and other reall changes. 320.
Fathers preuayled not againſt heretikes by only ſcripture. 47.
Fathers authoritie defended. 59. Reiected by heretikes. 16.
All Fathers ſtād for the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. 61.
Thear authoritie neceſſary, and right, by the heretikes thē ſelues againſt other heretikes. ibid.
Faith controleth ſenſe and reaſon and theaſe may be deceeued, that can not. 327.
Faith hath God his vvord for her principall fondation, yet in reſpect of vs dependeth of preachers authority. 6.
Al preachers euen in our age can not erre in matters of Faith. 66.
That faith may be ſeparated from good vvorkes, and ioyned vvith euill, proued. 389.

*Facere*, signifieth properly *Sacrificare*. 27.
Festiuall dayes in honor of Martyrs, proued out of Eusebius, Tertull. and S. Augustin. 291.
Frederick the 2. prostrate before the Pope abiureth schisme. 106.
What Freevvill Caluin graunteth. 399.
What Freevvill Catholikes graunt. 400.
Four shifts of heretiks, to auoid the argument of succession, but weake. 144.
Four kindes of eating Christs body. 316.
Forme of Baptisme is a cerimony according to Caluin, Brentius, and Bucer. 344.
Fornication can not hurt a faithfull man, proued out of Luthers and Caluines doctrine. 393.
Founders of the nevv religion most vicious. 209.
Friars and Nonnes proued ancient. 107.

G.

GHospellers breakers of Images. 136.
Ghospell neuer so richly preached as Luther saith. 149.
Ghospellers differ in Sacraments. 154.
Ghospellers differ in gouernement of their Churches therfore can not be one Church. 155.
Ghospellers differ in allovving bookes of Canonicall scripture. 157.
Ghnostickes concealed their obsceane doctrine Catholikes publish the theare faith. 191.
God not only couereth as heretikes say, but alsoe couering, cureth our sinnes. 256.
God can as easely conuert one thing into an other, as create all thinges of nothing. 320.
God according to Luther, Caluin, and others, the author of all sinnes. 355. 356. A sinner allo

according to them. 360. The only sinner also. 363. Vnreasonable also. 365. A cruell Tyrant also. 367.
God is iustice it selfe. 369.
God in effect denyed by Caluin, and a Idole set vp in his place, who is the God of Caluinists. 370. How all creatures in God, are God. 417. Similitudes declaringe the same. ibid. Vvee knovv not, vvhat God is, proued. 419. Three distinct vvayes, by vvhich vvee knovv God in this life, yet by none of them, *Quid sit*, but only, *An sit*. 420.
Grace habituall in Christ, is finite: of vnion infinite. 306.
Greeke Church since the reuolt hath neuer had a generall councell, for the space of 800 years. 78.
The Greeke Church hath noe true mission, since their refusall of subiection to the Pope. 38.

H.

HEretiques haue not the vvord of God, yet they alleage Scriptures. 51. They are, selfe louers. 54. They giue litle credit to the Fathers. 57. Noe more then Turkes or Ievves. 59.
Heretikes haue no probable, or credible motiues of their doctrine. 68.
Haue noe supreame head in matters of faith. 71. They reiect fathers. 61. And Councels. 76. They are not able to call a generall or nationall councel. 77. Wee can name the first hereticall Patriarches and Arch-bishopes in all Churches. 39.
Heretikes take name of their sect-Maisters, tru

beleeuers alvvayes called Catholikes. 116.
Heluidius and Iouinian, as alsoe Protestants, equalize mariage, vvith viriginitie. 132.
Heretikes may bee iustly punished, proued by scripture and reason. 185.
Heretikes proued, more lewde and vicious, then Catholikes. 208.
Hunnius a Lutheran, vvrit a booke of Caluins Iudaisme. 235.
Heretikes in resisting Christ vicar rebel against Christ. 263. Proued that they are brutish heretikes. 409.
Honor giuen to Christs Image and crosse, proued by ancient Fathers. 286.
Honor due to Saints, proued at large. 287.

I.

ILlyricus saith that Caluins Liturgie is full of sacrilege. 147.
Images, proued by ancient testimonies. 124.
Image breakers condemned in the councell of Nice. 136.
Hovv man is said to bee the Image of God. 396.
The Image of God noe more in a man then in a beast, proued out of Luther, and Caluin. 306.
Ievvel, Humfry, Sotcliff by lovvde lying say, they reiect ancient heresies. 140.
Ievvell, and Caluin make Christ a mediator as God, and soe inferior. 133.
Ievvell reiecteth fathers. 6.
He is an heretike about the Trinitie. 329.
S. Ihon Baptist vvashing as good as Christs baptisme according to Caluin. 344.
Impudency of Sotcliff in denying Luthers sain-

ges. 344.
Indulgences vvhat they are. 112.
Indulgences proued. ibid.
Indulgence giuen by S. Paule, to the inceſtuous Corinthian. 115.
Incredulitie only à Sinne according to Luther and Caluin, and only damneth. 390.
Infinite treaſur of Chriſts ſatisfaction remaning. 114.
Inquiſition againſt heretikes proued iuſt. 187.
Inuocation of Saints proued Religious. 294.
Iræneus confuteth the Ghnoſticks, by Apoſtolicall tradition. 182.
Irreuerence, leſſe to the Sacrament vvhen mice eat it, then vvhen vvicked and irrepentant Sinners. 315.
Iuriſdiction ordinarie, and by commiſſion, exterior, and interior. 16.
No ſupreme Iudge of faith in Sotcliffs Church. 80.

K.

KEmnitius and Caluin confeſs the Maſſe publickly vſed in all Chriſtendom, novv à 1000. years. 338.
Keyes of the Church, what they are. 16. They are tovv Order and Iuriſdiction. 16. Hovv they open and ſhot heauen gates. 17. The Key of ſcience and of povver. 17. They belonge properly to the Pope. ibid.
The povver of Keyes diſtinct from Baptiſme and preaching. 17. They are only in the Paſtors hand. 36.
Kinges of England, and France viſit the Apoſtles

tombes at Rome. 293.
Kingly authoritie sleitly regarded by heretikes, honorably respected by Catholikes. 13.
Hovv Kinges are second to God, hauing no superior, but God. 14.

L.

LAtin translation of the Bible purest and first for the Church. 188.
Laity receaueth Christs blood as really as the Priest, though not vnder the formes of vvine. 190.
Laity proued to haue receiued vnder one kind, in the primitiue Church. 190.
Our B. Lady called by ancient fathers destroyer of hereſies in the vvorlde, and vvhy. 300.
Our B. Lady only merited the circumstance of the Incarnation, and that *de congruo*, not *de condigno*. 301.
Lavves according to Luther and Caluin bind not. 371. 381.
Lavves commaunded. 381. brought in contempt by them. ibid. Promises according to their doctrine bind not. ibid.
In vvhat sense the ceremoniall lavv vvas hard to be kept of our forefathers. 402.
Hovv the lavv of the members is contrary to the lavv of the mind. 402.
Hovv fathers say to kepe the lavv, is impossible. 404.
Vve are freed from the lavv by Christ, according to Luther and Caluin. 406.
Luther no Bishop nor lavvfully sent. 33.
His opinion of the fall of the Church. 40. 41.
Luthers familiaritie vvith the deuill, vvho dispu-

teth againſt Prieſthood and priuat Maſſe. 91.
Luther permitteth the Huſband to take an other vvife, or his maide, if his vvife vvill bee gadding and doe not ſatisfie him. 93.
Lutherans, and Caluiniſts, vvith the Nouatians, deny the ſacrament of Penaunce. 138.
Luther and Caluin, Pelagians, for ſaying, children of the faithfull are ſaued without Baptiſme. 139.
Luther and Caluin With the Manichies deny free vvill. 140.
Lutherans iudge the Caluiniſts heretikes, and ſoe the Puritanes iudge Proteſtants. 151.
Lutherans and Caluiniſts, curſe on an other to Hell, and yet are members of one Churth. 152.
Lutherans and Sacramētaries proued to diſagree in noe ſmall matters of faith. 161.
Luthers cenſure of Sacramentaries. 159.
Luther tells Eraſmus that ſanctitie is not be requited of him, and his. 210.
Luthers confeſſion concerning the Romane Churche. 211.
Luthers Luciferian pride. 214.
Luther hateth, the vvord ὁμοούσιον, conſubſtantiall and belieth S. Hierom about it. 219.
Luther and Caluin like not the vvord Trinitie. 221.
Luther proued to ſay vvith Eutiches that the diuinitie ſuffered. 222.
Luther, Brentius and the vbiquetaries, proued to confound the tovv Naturs in Chriſt. 225.
Luther and Caluin affirme that noe hvv bindeth Chriſtians. 240.
Luther prayeth to the deuill, to pray for him. 295.

Lutherans and Caluinists differ in the vvorship of God, & therfore can not make one Church. 155.

Luther vrgeth ordinary and lavvfull mission against Anabaptists. 44.

Calleth S. Iames Epistle, *Straminea*. 51.

Discanonizeth Iob, Ecclesiasticus, and the three first ghospels. ibid. And the epistle to the Hebrevves. 52. Defendeth scriptures to be playne and easy. 52. Reiecteth fathers and councels. 57. 60. Raileth at S. Gregorie the great. 63. Reiecteth the first counceil vnder the Apostles. 76 And the generall councell of Nice. 76. His spirit priuat. 58. Maketh Christ ignorant. 140. Denieth hell. 280.

Luther exhorteth, not to take armes against the Turke. 378.

Raileth at Princes. ibid.

Luther confesseth, he receiued the Scriptures of the Romane Church. 416.

*Limbus Patrum* proued against Sotcliff. 118.

M.

MAgdeburgians in the 1, 2, and 3, age reiect many thinges as contrary to their doctrine. 147.

They finde straves, stubble, and errors, euen in the fathers of the primitiue Church. 148.

Mariage not forbidde by Catholikes, but to such only as haue vovved chastity. 91.

Mariage more honorably esteemed of Catholikes, then of heretikes. 92.

Mariage bind not according to Luther and Caluin. 181.

Mariage proued à Sacrament by ancient fathers. 139.
Mariage of Priests, forbidden in the first Nicene councell and in the 2, of Carthage. 175.
Markes of heretikes. 89.
Masse defended, from the heresie of the Colliridians. 125.
Masse proued by the fathers of the primitiue Churche. ibid.
Masse proued a Sacrifice properly. 337.
Melancthon, and Caluin proued to affirme God the author of sinne. 131.
Melancthon, Caluin, Sotcliff deny some part of their faith. 290.
Melancthon, and Carolstadius make Sacraments nothing but markes to distinguish, faithfull from Infidels. 342.
Ministers, of the Church can not be ordained by the people. 55.
Ministers of England hereticall Ministers, haue not powver of Keyes, not of feedinge Christs sheepe. 21. They haue noe lavvfull ordinatiõ. 31. They vvere made Bishops, in the chappel of the nagges head in cheape. 31. Authorized by Parlament. 32. Their mission not very ancient by Sotcliffs confession. 32.
An inuincible dilemma against their Mission. 32.
Minstrells as vvell as Ministers may by priuat spirit iudge of scripture. 195.
Miracles, noe markes of heretikes, but true miracles proofes of truthe. 179.
Miracles vvitnessed by ancient fathers. 180.

Miracles moſt ancient in proofe of our religion, none of Luthers. 280.
Mice may eat the Sacrament really, but not Sacramentally. 315.
Miſſion ordinary, or extraordinary neceſſary to all preachers. 4.
Without one of theſe Miſſiõs vvee are not bound to beleeue them. 4.7. The nevv reformers haue neather of both. 4. Noe more then other heretikes. 5.
Ordinary Miſſion, proued by ſucceſſion, extraordinary by miracles. 37.
Trevv miſſion is not inferred but of true ordination. 30.
Pretence of extraordinarie Miſſion, is a ſigne of falſe Prophets. 43.
Extraordinarie Miſſion muſt bee approued by ordinarie Paſtours. 43.
Monkes, friars and religious. 32. 43. in vvhat ſenſe they may proue their miſſion. 25.
Their life in ſubſtance is as ancient as the Apoſtles age. ibid. Their diuers rules and coſtumes are of a latre age. ibid.
Motiues of Sotcliff to vertu, reproued. 383.
Milke or beere as Luther ſaith may ſuffice in Baptiſme. 343.

N.

NEceſſitie of Sacraments proued in all lavves of nature, of Moyſes, and of Chriſt. 339.
Nationall councels in Sotcliffs Church not lavvful. 77.
Names diſcry heretikes. 116.
Tovv Natiuities in Chriſt. 301.

O.

OAths muſt haue three compagnions, iudgement, veritie, iuſtice, and ſuch oathes, muſt be kept. 207.
Oathes lavvfull in neceſſitie. 206.
Hovv Obedience is better then a ſacrifice. 437.
Olde heretickes condemned by generall councels, cā as vvell purge them ſelfes as Sotcliff. 172.
Optatus prooſeth the Donatiſts heretikes becauſe they vvear not vnited With Siricius Pope.
Originall ſinne hath blotted out the Image of God in man according to heretikes. 396.

P.

PApiſts truer of their promiſe then the Proteſtants. 201.
Paſtors ordinarie ſhall neuer vvant in the Church. 36. if they ſhould, God vvould ſend extraordinarie, vvho ſhould proue their miſſion. ibid.
Paſtors neuer ordayned by the people. 25.
Penaunce ſecret, is not ſufficient, vvhithout Sacramentall or auricular confeſſion. 18.
The Pope trod not on Frederikes neck. 106.
Pope comprehended vnder the name of Fathers, and grounded on them. 60.
Comprehended vnder the name of Apoſtles, Paſtors, and Doctors. 7. 8. Not excluded from Paſtorall authoritie, from tēporal greatneſſe. 8. If the Pope haue noe temporal iuriſdictiō, yet it repugneth not to him as Pope. 9. His ſpirit is not priuat. 55. His temporall eſtat confirmed by moſt ancient religious Princes, and Writers, and proued by reaſons. 9. 10. He can

not erre and how. 12. Killeth not Christs sheepe. 11. He hath noe temporal authoritie ouer Christian Kings or Kingdomes. 12. Yet ruleth, and deposeth Kinges resistinge his spirituall authoritie. 15. He hath commission to vse the Keys of the Church. 17. The Key of conscience is in the invvard court, the Key of iurisdiction in the out vvard court of the Church. 19. Hovv he feedeth Christs sheepe. 20. His supremacy proued. 72. He is the fondation of the Church. 85.

The aduersaries can not name the first Pope, vvho erred in faith, according to their opinion. 39.

Many Popes Saints and Martyrs, fevv of euil life. 21.

Povver of the cleargie giuen to the Prince by Parlament. 31.

Povver of office, and execution of the same are tovv diuers thinges. 11.

Povver temporall and spirituall may consist in one person. 9.

Tomporall Povver belongeth to temporall Princes and spirituall to Pastors. 12.

Spirituall Povver byndeth in conscience. 14.

Spirituall Povver of the Church, differeth from temporall povver of the common vvelth. 14.

Tomporall Povver ought to yeld to spirituall. 8.

They are both ordinarily in diuers subiects or gouerners. ibid.

Prayer taken avvay euen our Lords prayer. 311.

Prayers to Saintes, not leauing of God but rather supplicating to him by them. 312.

Prayers to Saintes allovved and practised by S. Hiero.

Hieron. 134.
Preaching à principall foundation of religion. 5.
As à cause Proponent, depends of a lavvfull mission. 6.
Predestination taketh avvay freevvill according to Caluin. 399.
Pride alvvaise ioyned vvith hereſie. 211.
Prieſthood, Sacrifice and religion, euer ioyned togeather. 332.
Proteſtants haue no Prieſthood no ſacrifice, and ſo no religion. ibid.
Prieſts miſſion to ſacrifice, fooliſhly impugned, by Sotcliff. 26.
Prieſts of Engländ at this day haue lavvfull miſſion and ſucceſſion. 43.
Princes, made no Princes by Caluin. 371.
Princes miſpriſed by Luther and Caluin. 372.
Princes rayled at by Luther. 378.
Princes may be depoſed according to them. 373.
The Prince ſubiect to the Pope in ſpirituall matters. 374.
Princes throats neuer cutt by Popes as Sotcliff lyeth, but many crovvned by them. 167.
The Prince ſupreme iudge in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall, according to Proteſtants, but not according to Caluin and Puritans. 375.
Princes haue exempted cleargie men. 377.
Princes ſvvordes, hovv ſubiect to the Pope. 378.
Priſcilianiſts only hold it lavvfull to deny their faith. 200.
Priuat ſpirit in Sotcliff and all heretikes. 55. 58.
It is a ſpirit of contradiction. 58. Openeth the gap to all hereſie. 56.

Proofes of equiuocation out of Scripture and Fathers. 204.
Proteſtants as alſo ſundry heretickes in the primitiue Church, enimies to Prieſts chaſtity and religious life. 97.
Proteſtants religion proued nevv. 164.
Proteſtants ringleaders, had their cõcubines. 123.
Pelagius hereſie truly proued in Proteſtants, and falſly imputed by Sotcliff to Catholikes. 130.
Proteſtãts, profeſſe them ſelues image breakers. 225.
Proteſtants noe leſs marked for heretikes in puniſhing Catholikes, then Catholikes in puniſhing heretikes. 183.
Proteſtants vvith the Meſſalians, and Caians ſay that Sacraments confere not grace. 138.
Proteſtants vvith the Gnoſtickes, Encratites, and Manichees deny Matrimonie to bee a Sacrament or holy thing. 139.
Proteſtants proued heretikes for vvant of ſucceſſion. 141.
Proteſtants ſeeke euaſions by the Churches inuiſibility. 148.
Proteſtants inferior to the Synagogue of the Ievves. 167.
Proteſtants proued to make Chriſt an abſurd redeemer 236.
Proteſtãts doctrine maketh Chriſt no phiſitiõ. 255
Proteſtants doctrine maketh Chriſt no Prieſt. 263
There doctrine of the imputatiue iuſtice maketh vs moſt perfectly iuſt, all æqually iuſt, yea all as iuſt as Chriſt. 272. & ſeq. They diſhonor the mother of God & al Saintes. 283. They haue

burned Sainctes Reliques in Englād and France. 296. Their presumption, in being assured of their saluation refuted. 323. They deny Christs eternall Priesthood. 330. They come in sheeps clothing that is in the letter of scripture to couer their heresie. 184. They are greatest equiuocators, for breaking their faith to God. 206. They being made Catholiques change their euil manners into better. 209.
Protestants speake most dishonorably of the Trinitie. 218. And of Christ. 245. A deduction how the Protestant religion can not be the true. 438.
Purgatorie, proued ancient. 110.
Puritans, censured Schismatikes, by Protestants, and excommunicated. 158.

Q.

QVeene Elizabeth had authority giuen her by the Parlament, ouer cleargie, and Synods. 74.

R.

REall presence of Christ in the sacrament proued to destroy neyther art nor reason. 325.
Reasons why the church forbad the chalice. 191.
Reasons of pronouncing the Canons in a loe voice. 194.
Reasons why the Church forbad the laity to dispute of religion. 196.
Redemption not obteined by the sacrifice of the Masse, but the sacrifice of the crosse, applied. 329.
Reformers Church, neuer seene nor hard till Luther. 165.
Reformers can haue noe prayers in their Chur-

ches, nether may they say the *Pater noster*, noe nor haue a sermon according to their doctrine. 350.
Pretended Reformers haue nether true faith nor vvorshipp of God. 44. Wee can not more receiue them, then all other falses Prophets. 44.
Reformers of faith, must produce credible motiues of their commission. 83.
Religion ought to be proposed by credible motiues. 67.
In respect of vs dependeth vpon men. 83.
Religious life alovved by generall consent of ancient Fathers. 96.
Ringing of Bels to Masse proued very ancient. 349.
The Romane Church, vvas & is the true church, and euer shall bee. 101.
Romane faith and Catholike faith all one. 119.
Romane church, Catholike, because extended to all countryes and tymes. 165.

S.

SEuen Sacraments proued by scripture and fathers. 149.
Sacraments but little esteemed by Protestants, as accounted nothing but seales of precedent grace. 342.
Sacrifice proued necessary in all religions. 334.
Sacrifice of the Masse euidently proued by the fathers. 26. 335. 337.
Shauen crounes of Priests proued ancient and reasons thearof. 107.
Saint Bennets miracles proued against Sotc. 65.
S. Gregorie Nazianzen compareth temporall

powver to the body, and spirituall to the sovvle. 10.
S. Gregorie the great our Apostle. 63.
Praysed by all Antiquitie. 63. 64.
Rayled at by Luther and Sotcliff. 64. His Dialogues defended. 64. 65.
S. Gregorie gaue Indulgences. 116.
Saints can help vs as vvell as Angells. 134.
Satisfaction and merit in the same vvorke, by sundry respects. 114.
Satisfaction of our B. Lady, S. Anon Baptist, and others Saincts layd vp in the Churches treasure. 115.
Hovv vvee may satisfie and yet Christ be our Redeemer. 245.
Some schoolemen affirme that Christ had taken flesh though Adam had not sinned, others deny it. 238.
Scripture is not supreme iudge of faith. 75.
Scripture is pretended by all manner of heretikes. 45. It belongeth only to Catholiques by preseription. 33. Is hard and ambiguous. 32. plyable to diuers purpoles. 50. Is not the bare letter, but joyned vvith the lavvfull sense. 49. In a false sense it is not the vvord of God, but of the deuill. 50.
Only Scripture is not vrged by Christ against the deuill. 46. Nor by the fathers against heretikes. 47. Nor by Councels. 47.
Scripture diuulged in vulgar tongues, made many heretikes in K. Henryes and Q. Maryes tymes. 198.
Scripture contradicted by Sotcliff. 400.

That all the receiued Scripture, is canonicall proued. 425.
Seruetus and his hereſie learned of Caluin. He vvas burnt by him at *Geneua*. 217.
Sect-maiſters condemned by generall councels, alvvaiſe reputed heretikes. 172.
Senſe can not diſcerne ſubſtance, nether is it deceiued in the real preſence. 316.
Simonians, and Menandrians denied the Eucharift to bee the fleſh of Chriſt. Soe Caluin. 138.
Noe ſinne to be auoided according to heretikes. 392.
All may refuſe conſent to the motions of Sinne, yet none vvear free from ſuch motions. Chriſt and his bleſſed mother excepted. 403.
To feele concupiſcēce is not à Sinne but to conſent thearunto. 404.
Sinne according to Caluin can not hurt a faithfull man. 241.
Sotcliff anſvveareth diuers argumēts, vvith à bare deniall of the concluſion. 339. He fondly belieth Catholikes about baptizing Belles, 348. He can not auoyd the marke of an heretike, for breaking out of the Church 89. He fondly chargeth Catholikes for renevving old hereſies, 122. He alleageth nothing that may exclude an heretike out of his Church. 162. His Church cōtayneth ſundry ſectes and hereſies. 164.
Sotcliff muſt ſhevv vvhear his Church lurked 1500. years. 149. He and his heretikes condemned by the knovven Church. 171. He and his fallovves heretikes by his ovvne

confession, for denying many bookes of ſcripture. 178. He can by noe meanes ſhevv what booke is ſcripture. 177.
Sotcliff maketh his Biſhops yea the King heretikes for allovving the ſigne of the croſſe by only tradition. 182.
He maketh à marke of an heretike to detruncate ſcripture, and ſoe condemneth him ſelfe. 188.
He fondly accuſeth heretikes to cõceale their doctrine. 195. He impudently denieth vvords expreſſely found in Luthers cõmentaries vpon *Geneſis*. 218. He forſaketh his Sect-maiſters opinion of iuſtification. 238. He vvickedly denyeth that one drop of Chriſts bloud, had bene ſufficient to redeeme vs. 241.
Sotcliff chargeth Kelliſon vvith contradiction, vvheat is none. 244. He rageth at ſchoolemen but ignorantly. 245. He maketh Saints of heauen ſinners ſtill. 258. He ſurueyeth ſchoole pointes vvhich he knovveth not. 297.
He ſometime is à Thomiſt, ſometime à Scotiſt ſometimes neyther. 299. He falſly alleageth *Catiſfederenſis*. 311.
He is little better then à Ievv or a Turke to argue of diuine matters by ſenſe. 317. He denyeth Gods Omnipotency. 319.
He is proued nether good Artiſt nor Arithmetician. 325. A ſilly Philoſopher about locall motion. 327. He fondly obiecteth places of the Canon, vvhich are their explicated. 328.
He belieth Kelliſon of Blaſphemy. 330. He raileth hauing nothing els to ſay. 332.
Sotcliffs his vvife may be à Prieſt according to

Protestants Priesthood 333. He can deriue his peregree no higher then Luther. 345. He vvilfully mistaketh the intent of the authors first booke. 1. He allovveth fiue grovvndes of his religion, vvhich yet before he had denied. 3. He is not able to proue his mission. 3. what Key he carieth. 11. He saith noe more for his mission, than all heretikes doe. 5. Sotcliffs absurde argumentes against the Catholickes mission discussed. The first absurd, and against him selfe. 7. 8. The secõd turned against him selfe. 11. His third vvithout reason, and proofe. 12. The fourth an assertion vvithout a probation. 21. The fift common to him and all old heretikes. 22. & seq. His argumẽts for his priuate mission discussed. 30. Sotcliff threatned the bastonado by a soldiar at Calez. 3. He knovveth not vvhat the povver of Keyes meaneth. 16. His monstrous leap. 23. He plaieth the false naturally. 26. He is neyther a humanist nor scripturist. 28. Proueth him self and his vvife to be Bishops. 28. He incurreth a premunire for denying the kinges supremacy. 29. 30. He denyeth the conclusion, graunting the prehises, and the somme. 46. His vayne bragges. 38. Sotcliff vvhen he can not answer he helps out the matter vvith Lyes. 46. His Lyes. 70. 73. & seq. 87. and a 1000. others in other places. Belieth Doctor Stapleton and Canus. 84. 85. and Bellarmin. 85. His impudencye. 63. Rayleth against Church and Saintes. 61. He is a Patricide. 61.

His contradictions. 3. 81. and many other places.
He is a turne coate from a Protestant to a Puritan, for vvant of a Bishoprik. 39. He answereth like will Summers. 55. 69. 72. His fonde iesting. ibid. Impudetly belieth the author. 21. Possessed by a Dumme Diuell. 56. Runnes in circle like a Milchorse. 56. Is an Archenoddy. 4
Sotclif buildes his faith vpon councels and Prince, and soe contradicteth him selfe, and his Maisters, and Doctors of his Church. 432.
His reasons for the knovving of the number of the canonicall bookes, disproued. 428.
He carpes at trifles for vvant of matter. 418.
He belieth Kellison, ibid. He hath noe assurance of scripture. 424.
Societie taken avvay. 58. 382.
Succession a sure marke of ordinary mission. 37.
Succession euer a marke of the true Church. 140.
Succession in Popes & Catholike Bishops most certaine. 38. Personall vvithout intermission, or degeneration from former doctrine. 38.
Vrged by Tertullian. 39. by S. Cyprian. 39. by Ireneus. 38. by S. Augustin. 39.
Succession of Greekes is broken. 39.
Succession of heretikes, is eyther by interruptiō, or inuisibilitie, and both disproued. 40.
Succession is not necessary in Sotcliffs opinion, but the contrary is proued. 40.
Leo represseth the pride of Anatolius Patriarch of Constātinople, and therfore his Superior. 174.

T.

TEaching contrary to the Apostles doctrine, noe marke of an heretike, because as obscu-

re as hereſie. 138.
Temporall puniſhment remayneth after the ſinne is pardoned. 113.
Tertullian denieth to diſpute vvith heretikes by bare ſcripture, but refuteth them by Tradition. 142. He ſhevveth avvay to proue vvhat the Apoſtles taught. 178.
Theodoſius, vrged tradition againſt Arians. 48.
Thinges hollovved by the Churchs prayers, may be able to terrify deuils. 349.
Thomiſts, Scotiſts, Benedictins, Franciſcans, ſignifie, noe diuerſitie in religion. 117.
Tigurines, complayne that Luther maketh him ſelfe the Apoſtle of Germany. 149.
Toby Matthevves iudgement, of reading the fathers. 62.
Tranſubſtantiation euidently proued, by the ancient fathers. 321.
Traditions noe marke of hereſie. 181.
Brentius graunteth that by Traditiõ vvee knovv, vvhich is ſcripture. 430.
Tribunals brought in contempt by Luther and Caluin. 389.
The three perſons of the Trinitie, may aſſume one individual nature. 299.
True religion more ancient then hereſie, and Catholikes then Proteſtants. 103.
Tvvo thinges in Sinne, the act, and the malice, the one paſſeth, and the other remaineth. 459.

V.

VIgilantius and Proteſtants marrye Prieſts, and deſpiſe reliques. 133.
Vnity in faith and Church is not amongeſt Lu-

therans and Caluinists. &c. 151.
Visible head necessary in the Church. 71. 72.
Noe visible Church of Lutherās before Luther. 41
Visiting of Martyrs tombes proued by most ancient fathers. 292.
Vowes made, must bee rendered. 93.

W.

Vhittaker reiecteth all the Fathers. 61. He is an heretike about the Trinitie. 329.
Vvicleffs Image crowned, the Image of Christ defiled by Hierom of Prague. 137.
Vword of God vvritten and deliuered by Tradition is of the same force. 330.
Vvorkes of iust and faithfull men are sinnes according to Caluin. 393.
S. Paule neuer did good vvorke according to Luther and Caluin. 395.
Vvorshiping of Images, approued by the Councell of Nice. 135.

Z.

Zvinglians and Lutherans inuectiues, one against an other. 160.
Zuinglius, and Oecolampadius, are Pelagians for denying originall sinne in the children of the faithfull. 130.
Zuinglius saith God fauoreth al Christians as wel as he doth his sonne, yea that all haue as much right to heauen as Christ. 273.

FINIS.

IN marg. lin 1. instit. ca. 8. for lib. 1. ca. 18. pag. 41. in marg. 21 supend, for Staplet. præfa: contra vvuak. pag. 61. annua, for annus pa. 19. lin. 28. vvhho, for vvho, pa. 168. lin. 19. pmach, for preach, pag. 251. a. not be, for not to be, pag. 26. b. line. 24. preachife, for practise, pag. 34. b. line. 12. priastue, for primatine, ibid. dor, for do it. ibid. iauth, for faith, pag. 39. b. lin. 9. manet, for name, pa. 40. a. lin. 9. them, for then, pag. 82. b. lin. 4. fely, for feyle, pa. 95. a. lin. 17. fame, for lame, pag. 98. a. lin. 2. scriguare, for scriptures, pag. 95. b. lin. 10. pto. vyted, for povvred, pag. 76. a. lin. 24. at, for as, pag. 78. b. lin. 21. thet, for shall, pag. 85. b. lin. 9. vvickely, for vvickedly, pag. 30. a. lin. 25. the, for then, pa. 95. b. lin. 11. thee, for the, pag. 101. a. lin. 18. a. noorhe, for another, pag. 106. a. lin. 11. Cosholicker, for Catholicker, pag. 108. a. lin. 9. ihald, for shall, pag. 199. b. lin. 19. is name, for is my name, pag. 118. a. lin. 16. thy, for they, pag. 134. b. lin. 11. shalts, for shalts, pa. 144. lin. 30. & 15. & 18. did, for did, pag. 148. b. line. 13. Apostoliast, for Apostiatre, pag. 150. a. eades, for heades, pa. 166. a. lin. 7. leeking, for looking, ib. d. lin. 8. shall, for shalbe, pag. 167. b. lin. 3. shes, for his, pag. 168. lin. 1. heame, for became, pag. 189. b. lin. 2. they, for then, pag. 210. b. lin. 35. grodgh, for grough, pag. 186. a. lin. 9. abovv, for alovv, pag. 193. b. lin. 16. vas, for vs, p. 195. b. lin. 10. abreade, for abroad, pag. 196. a. lin. 31. the, for the, pag. ibid. b. lin. 11. hirare, for heaven, pag. 203. b lin. 7. burical, for burial, pag. 210. b. lin. 3. sovve, for lovve, pag. 211. b. lin. 4. & 5. vvord, for vvorld, pag. 214. a. lin. 15. infulles, for insulses, ibid lin. 16. Euagelists, for Euagelista, ibid. lin. 29. olod for of God, pa. 217. b. lin. 1. mian, for men, pa. 218. a lin. 16. ye, for the, ibid lin. 19. vvere, for vvese, pag. 262. b. lin. 4. haft, for laft, pag. 263. b. lin. 16. vnbloody, for bloody, pa. 265. b. lin. 7. lazy, for lady. 272. a. pa. lin. 22. redeem, for redeemer, pa. 278. b. miculous, for miraculous. 294. a. lin. 1. diuinite, for diuinitie, pag. 304. b. lin. 15. vvhotely, for vvorthely, pag. 317. a. lin. 26. visible, for insisible, pag. 319. a. lin. 27. vvord, for vvodd, pag. 319. b. lin. 5. garanted, for vvaranted, pag. 349. lin. 25. patrien, for patient, pa. 353. a. lin. 7. her, for hee, pag. 372. b. lin. 11. vvisilye, for vvisely, pa. 416. a. lin. 7. rist, for first, ibid. b. lin. 6. it past, for it to passe, pa. 419. a. lin. 22. in ovvler, for an offler, pa. 416. a. li. 22.

